

# RELATING TO THE CALLING OF AN ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION  
ON  
**S. Con. Res. 12**  
A RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CALLING OF AN  
ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

---

JULY 11, 1956

---

**PART 2**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama	BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana	HOMER E. CAPEHART, Indiana

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*

C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Statement of—	
Bonbrake, Mrs. A. E., representing the Catholic Action Guild, Forest Hills, N. Y.-----	190
Burke, Hon. Thomas H., former Member of Congress; member, board of governors, Atlantic Union Committee, Washington, D. C.-----	213
Erb, Mrs. Ray L., chairman, National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution-----	155
Griswold, Mrs. Enid, Montclair, N. J., representing the United States Flag Committee, Jackson Heights, N. Y.-----	184
Hacker, Mrs. Myra C., West Englewood, N. J. (presenting statement of Mrs. John R. Wiborg, of Tacoma, Wash)-----	164
Hardie, Mrs. Jessie, Short Hills, N. J., New Jersey Chapter of Pro America, Inc., West Orange, N. J.-----	174
Hart, Merwin K., president, National Economic Council, New York City, N. Y.-----	160
Shea, William P., attorney, Ronkonkoma, N. Y.-----	197
Streit, Clarence K., Missoula, Mont., board of governors, Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.-----	199
Williams, Mrs. Lillian C., Northern New Jersey Study Group, Ridgewood, N. J.-----	178
Statements and other communications submitted for the record—	
Revised draft of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12-----	154
Letter from George Meany, president, AFL-CIO-----	216
Letter from John A. Baker, assistant to the president, National Farmers Union-----	217
Resolution of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, N. Y.-----	218
Letter from Leland B. Henry, executive director, the Council of the Diocese of New York-----	218
Atlantic Union resolution passed by the Senate of Canada-----	219
Statement by Mrs. Chase S. Osborn of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.-----	219
Excerpt from mutual security hearings by Senate Foreign Relations Committee—statement by General Gruenther-----	221
Statement of Livingston Hartley-----	222
Letter from J. E. Berry, Edinburg, Tex.-----	223
Letter from Marcia C. J. Matthews, McAllen, Tex.-----	224
Letter from Doris B. Parker-----	224
Letter from Harold L. Putnam, executive secretary, National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution-----	225
Letter from P. A. del Valle, president, Defenders of the American Constitution-----	226
Telegram from Elmo Roper, president, Atlantic Union Committee---	226
Letter and statement from Elsie French Johnston, corresponding secretary, National Society for Constitutional Security-----	226
Statement by Mrs. Isabella J. Jones, chairman, National Legislation Committee, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.-----	227
Letter from the Hon. Estes Kefauver, United States Senator from the State of Tennessee, enclosing correspondence with Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State-----	228
Letter from Imogen McMurty, Marysville, Calif.-----	231
Statement by Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, United States Representative from Michigan-----	231
Letter from Hon. Estes Kefauver, United States Senator from the State of Tennessee, enclosing correspondence with the Foreign Ministers of Italy and Norway-----	232

	Page
Statements and other communications submitted for the record—Con.	
Correspondence with Helen P. Lassell, the United States Flag Committee-----	233
Letter from Hon. James E. Murray, United States Senator from the State of Montana, containing the resolution of the National Student Congress-----	234
Letter from Edwin S. Bettelheim, Jr., adjutant general and treasurer general, Military Order of the World Wars-----	234
Letter from Nagene C. Bethune, Guardians of Our American Heritage-----	235
Letter from H. Joseph Mahoney, Brooklyn, N. Y., enclosing a clipping from the New York Tablet entitled "On Staying Free"-----	235
Letter from Leonora W. Kendall, president, Pennsylvania Chapter III, National Society for Constitutional Security-----	236
Letter from Doris B. Parker, Glen Rock, N. J.-----	237
Statement by R. R. Pursell, Pursell Publishing Co., Plymouth, Mich-----	237
Letter from Harry T. Everingham, executive director, We, the People-----	238
Letter and statement from Verne P. Kaub, American Council of Christian Laymen-----	239
Statement by Maj. F. J. Toohey, For America League, Grand Rapids, Mich-----	240
Letter and resolution from Mary M. Streit, chairman, Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalsists-----	241
Letter from Percival Brundage, Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President-----	242

## RELATING TO THE CALLING OF AN ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

---

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:25 a. m., in room P-63, United States Capitol Building, Senator Theodore Francis Green, presiding.

Present: Senators Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, and Hickenlooper.

Senator HUMPHREY. Ladies and gentlemen, I will open the hearing.

If the witnesses do not mind, we will start. We will proceed with the first witness, and then go to the balance of our witnesses.

### ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

This morning we are holding the third hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which would request the President to invite other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a convention which would explore the extent to which these countries might further develop the economic and political ties between them.

The first two hearings were held on July 25 and 29 of last year. At that time we heard everyone who requested to testify, including three representatives of the groups who were opposed to the resolution.

However, a number of groups and individuals apparently did not learn of the hearing in time to appear. The Foreign Relations Committee therefore agreed to give those who applied to be heard after the original hearings, an opportunity to testify.

In view of the number of witnesses before us this morning, the committee would appreciate if statements could be made as brief as possible. We will be glad to have put into the record any additional material of reasonable length.

I should simply say at this time, since I read this opening statement, for the benefit of the witnesses, that there have been revisions, as you may have heard, suggested revisions and drafts of this Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 which I would say substantially alter the meaning of the language as well as the express detail of the language.

Whether or not all the witnesses have had an opportunity to be apprised of that, I am not sure. But I would say that you might want to give consideration to it, and at the appropriate time, if you would like to have one of us read that revised resolution, we will be more than happy to do so.

I have a copy of the revised resolution, which has been discussed from time to time in executive session in the committee, but, as you know, the chairman of this committee did not want to take any action until all parties had had an opportunity to be heard, and there were a number of people who had asked to be heard.

So we refrained from any action until you could be heard.

The first witness is Mrs. Ray L. Erb. As I understand, she is the chairman of the Defense Committee of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. ERB. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mrs. Erb, we welcome you to the committee.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the revised copy of this resolution, to which you made reference, be made a part of the record.

Senator HUMPHREY. That will be done at this time. I will make a copy of it available to the clerk.

(The revised draft of S. Con. Res. 12 is as follows:)

#### REVISED DRAFT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere, without regard to color, creed, race, or religion, demands united action by democracies; and

Whereas one of the surest hopes for peace in the world is for even the stronger democracies to become still stronger and more united; and

Whereas our existing international machinery appears unable to cope with a number of problems resulting from Communist efforts to undermine and create instability in some democracies; and

Whereas we need to unite our efforts with other democracies further in such fields as the joint training of scientists and engineers and the creation of a pool of scientific and engineering aid for underdeveloped countries if they are to become strong bastions of democracy; and

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has already committed its members to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions," and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas it is essential to determine by what other means the democracies can further unify their efforts in the military, political, and economic fields to achieve these objectives; and

Whereas it is desirable that this problem, which concerns the basis rather than the conduct of our relations with other democracies, be considered by delegates who would act in accordance with their individual convictions and make a public report of their joint findings and recommendations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—*

1. That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations, and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic, and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

2. At such convention there shall be --- delegates from the United States at least two-thirds of whom shall be drawn from private life. They shall be appointed and vacancies filled, half by the President of the Senate and half by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not more than one-half of the delegates shall be members of any one political party.

3. The delegates shall each have one vote in the convention; they shall not be subject to governmental instructions but shall act in accordance with their individual convictions.

4. The number of delegates invited from each country shall be in broad proportion to its population by the last official census, but shall be so constituted that the delegates from no country shall form a majority of the convention.

5. All arrangements preparatory to the convention shall be made by a joint committee of Congress composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The convention shall establish its own rules and agenda.

6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the contingent funds of the House and Senate not otherwise appropriated so much as may be required to provide for the expenses of the delegates from the United States and of such staff as may be necessary and for the share of the United States in the costs of the convention.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mrs. Erb, if you, or any other witness here, would like a copy of this draft we do have some mimeographed copies of the revised draft.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. RAY L. ERB, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION**

Mrs. ERB. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my gratitude for the privilege of presenting my statement relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 before the distinguished members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am Mrs. Ray L. Erb, chairman, national defense committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, otherwise referred to as the Atlantic Union Resolution, now under consideration, proposes a "convention" to consider political union, of the United States, with other nations, which, in turn, will function under an international governing body—with each party subject, of course, to the vote and decision of same.

The Genocide Convention, a booklet published by the United Nations, states—

But "Convention" in international law is an agreement between sovereign nations. It is a legal compact which pledges every signatory country to accept certain obligations. Broadly speaking it is a treaty between many nations.

Hence, since in international language a convention is a treaty, the adoption of the findings of such a convention would be the same as ratifying a treaty. In the United States, because treaties become the supreme law of the land, we might find we had laws which would displace and destroy our Constitution.

It is respectfully suggested that this interpretation of "convention" be given serious consideration by the members of this committee.

A study of the published writings and statements, also the testimony as given before this committee, of proponents and supporters of the aforementioned resolution, would certainly indicate approval of its ambitions.

Every Member of the United States Congress is under oath to "defend and protect the Constitution of the United States." Is, therefore, membership or support by public officials, whether of the legislative, executive, or judicial departments, in organizations whose objectives include the subservience of the Constitution and laws of the United States of America to those of any organization of nations, and the consequent destruction of our present form of government, compatible with their oath of office, and their obligation to our Nation?

## DANGERS OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

The plan of Atlantic Union and strategy for the tangible fulfillment thereof, was conceived and prepared years ago, with the ensuing propaganda being determined and relentless. Its emotional appeal lies in the claim that acceptance of the objectives of Atlantic Union would result in worldwide peace, whereas a dispassionate and factual analysis would indeed lend grave doubts as to the feasibility of this utopian solution.

The publications of the Atlantic Union Committee definitely confirm the ultimate goal to be that of world government. Thus, the liberties and independence of American citizenship as enjoyed in our Republic under our Constitution would be sacrificed to world citizenship under an international union.

To quote from only one of many sources, namely, an address entitled, "The Goal Is Government of All the World," given by Mr. Elmo Roper, the present president of Atlantic Union, in 1948, which briefly summarizes its underlying purpose:

We must start building toward one world now, today, positively, with a clear head and with a firm faith that if we can lay one stone in the foundation we will be able to lay more stones there, and, eventually, build a structure of peace.

These governments would merge into a single Atlantic Federal Union. Such a nation would have the right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between states in the Union, and grant Union citizenship. The Union must have the power to tax and to uphold its own bill of rights \* \* \*

In an article entitled, "First Step in Atlantic Union?" published in the May 1951 issue of Freedom and Union, the question is asked how such an Atlantic Authority must be constituted. The answer: "Permanent establishment of such an authority might necessitate constitutional action by the United States."

The wise architects of the Constitution provided for change by amendment, so our question is: Might it not prove possible, unless the American citizens are alert, to abolish the supremacy of the Constitution by a constitutional act?

An Atlantic Union publication entitled, "Stop World War III with Atlantic Union," states:

Once Atlantic Union was formed, any nation would qualify for membership whenever it met the test of democratic government—free elections and a bill of rights actually enforced. The Union would thus gradually expand into a world government which safeguarded freedom.

In a democracy the people are sovereign—not the government. Under the Bill of Rights, American citizens retain certain basic rights to themselves. The others they delegate in free elections to their city, State, and National Governments.

By creating this larger Union, you the citizen, would merely transfer to the men you elected to the Atlantic Union Government some of the powers you now entrust to your representatives in Washington. The United States Federal Government would lose some of its delegated authority, but individual citizens would retain their full sovereignty.

Does not this sovereignty consist of the citizen's privilege to assist in the election of representatives to an international governing body where these representatives would be constantly challenged by those whose ideologies and values are not in harmony with those of the United States Republic functioning under the sovereign power of the Constitution?



A far cry from delegating citizen's power to the United States Representatives in Congress.

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, have consistently, for several years, adopted resolutions expressing opposition to any form of world government.

We are dedicated to the preservation of our Republic functioning under the supreme power of the Constitution of the United States.

We are definitely opposed to the least consideration of a resolution as described in Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mrs. Erb.

Senator SPARKMAN?

#### DEFINITION OF "CONVENTION"

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Erb, I noted with interest you were discussing the word "convention." Even though in international law one meaning given to "convention" is something akin to a treaty or agreement or meeting of minds, you do not seriously contend that that excludes other common meanings?

As a matter of fact, the very essence of the word "convention" as it comes from the Latin is a coming together. It is a meeting of persons.

You would not exclude that common meaning, would you?

Mrs. ERB. I would not exclude that common meaning, but in this quotation it definitely states in regard to the international situation, "But 'convention' in international law is an agreement between sovereign nations."

Senator SPARKMAN. That is just one use of the word.

Mrs. ERB. That is true.

Senator SPARKMAN. The point I am trying to make is that certainly you cannot, from reading this resolution, get the idea that it was intended to be a treaty. What it really means is a coming together of persons, a gathering, and that is all it means.

I think that is the only fair interpretation one can read into this.

Mrs. ERB. This is on an international basis, is it not, Senator?

Senator SPARKMAN. Oh, yes, but people can come together on an international basis without treaty-making in any way whatsoever.

Mrs. ERB. Then you feel that a convention, even though it is on an international basis, would not be deserving of an interpretation as given here?

Senator SPARKMAN. If it simply means in this resolution a common getting together of people, it means a meeting.

Yes, according to my interpretation there is nothing in this resolution that could in any way bind this Government or any other government that had representatives participating in it.

My understanding is that this would simply be a meeting of representatives of these several governments to explore certain possibilities, and that is all.

Mrs. ERB. You don't think this interpretation will have any effect?

Senator HUMPHREY. Not at all. We do use the word "convention," but when we use it we use it in that sense and for that purpose.

Mrs. ERB. Then you do not accept—

Senator HUMPHREY. Just like any word, so many words we have, have different meanings, and you have just pulled out one particular meaning.

Mrs. ERB. I pulled out the one that was rather alarming, and asked the members of the committee to consider it very seriously.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes; I recognize that fact.

#### DAR ATTITUDE TOWARD NATO

Let me ask you this, Mrs. Erb, and I should know but I do not know: What is the attitude of the DAR on NATO? As I recall, the DAR did endorse NATO.

Mrs. ERB. They have not taken any official position on NATO, Senator, and I can only speak from that standpoint.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, in your own personal view, do you recognize NATO and the defenses that have been built up through the agency of NATO in western Europe, as being an essential part of the security of the free world?

Mrs. ERB. There again, I don't believe I can answer that, because I am here in an official position, and we have not taken any official position on that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I recognize that, and I ask you for your own personal views.

Mrs. ERB. I don't feel I can give that.

Senator SPARKMAN. All right. Thank you.

Mrs. ERB. Thank you, Senator.

#### REVISED RESOLUTION

Senator HUMPHREY. Mrs. Erb, just before you leave, it is a little unfair, may I say, that we did not get you a revised draft of the resolution, and I do not expect you to make any definitive statement as to your views on it.

The original resolution which was introduced by Senator Kefauver and others, on February 9, 1955, has been rather, I would say, drastically amended in terms of a revised draft which, may I say, has not been introduced in the form of a new resolution.

Mrs. ERB. I see.

Senator HUMPHREY. It is merely before us for consideration in terms of a proposal which, following hearings such as this and agreement on the part of the committee will be considered.

In that revised draft, it is made explicitly clear that the persons going to such convention within the interpretation and definition of the word "convention" made by Senator Sparkman, would go there only as individuals, not representing governments, nor would they go there with any official authority except as citizens from the NATO countries who were interested in trying to explore means and methods to unify their efforts in military, political, and economic fields.

Under the resolution, it resolves:

That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from

such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations, and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs, their joint defense, and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

I think you will note that that language is a considerable modification of the original language.

Mrs. ERB. I see.

Senator HUMPHREY. It would be, at best, an exploratory discussion, with recommendations, if the group of delegates could agree upon recommendations, as to how you might implement, strengthen, unify, and effectuate the purposes of NATO in the military, the economic, and the political field.

#### VIEWS OF GENERAL GRUENTHER

I was interested in the statement of General Gruenther, a servant of our people for whom I have the highest regard, and I am sure you would share in that regard. He is a truly great American.

Mrs. ERB. Of course.

Senator HUMPHREY. I asked him this question :

You are familiar with the proposal for a NATO convention, that is, for representatives of NATO countries to get together and talk over the possibility of strengthening NATO?

How do you feel about such an exploratory convention?

General Gruenther's reply :

General GRUENTHER. I feel that the bringing together of representatives of NATO nations is desirable.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think it would be helpful in terms of political unity of our NATO pact countries?

General GRUENTHER. Yes; I think any decision that would improve mutual understanding of the problems of the NATO nations would be helpful.

I think I should say that General Gruenther's testimony went on to develop the importance of strengthening the ties of the NATO countries. He felt that there was an urgent necessity for this.

Furthermore, Admiral Radford, when he testified before our committee, as you may recall, Senator Sparkman, pointed out that he thought the major difficulty facing us today, particularly among our allies, was on the political and the economic front.

I recall Admiral Radford's statement. He thought that militarily we were making excellent progress. But he thought that the political and the economic front needed further strengthening, and it was within this context that these questions were asked.

Mrs. ERB. I see.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to thank you very much, Mrs. Erb.

Mrs. ERB. Thank you, Senator.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

The next witness is Mr. Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, of New York City.

**STATEMENT OF MERWIN K. HART, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL  
ECONOMIC COUNCIL, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.**

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Hart, would you like to proceed?

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear on behalf of the National Economic Council, with members in all States of the United States, an organization formed 26 years ago.

Gen. Bonner Fellers, the executive director of For America, has seen this statement that I am about to make, and has asked to be associated with me on this statement on behalf of For America.

General Fellers, executive director of For America, recently said:

Today there exists in the Pentagon a certain document marked "Secret." It was written soon after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. These disasters strengthened the dreams of those who believe in internationalism. Here, the authors of the document wrote, was a proven weapon so deadly that its use would have to be controlled. Among the family of sovereign states no nationalist power could be entrusted with it. Only a world state, acting in accordance with international law, should control such a deadly weapon. Nationalist states—their sovereignty yielded—must be permitted armed forces for internal security only. In the interest of peace all nuclear weapons must be in the hands of the world state.

The above is apparently the basis for a news dispatch from Ottawa, Canada, published in the Kansas City Star, Monday, December 13, 1954, which said that:

Creation of a super Atlantic Community agency to merge the economic, defense, and foreign policies of the United States with other countries will be recommended to members of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Paris this week.

This same news dispatch said a statement has been signed which declares:

This is no time for halfhearted measures. While welcoming the progress made toward European union, we believe that nothing less than an effectively integrated Atlantic Community \* \* \* will in the end adequately meet the challenge of the times. Defense in today's terms extends beyond military requirements and into the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our lives.

Among the signers of this statement are Harry Truman, Gen. George C. Marshall, Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee, Clarence K. Streit, Edward Murrow, and Elmer Davis.

The news dispatch concluded with the statement:

NATO already has authority to adopt the proposed program, it is pointed out in the petition, under article II, commonly called the Canadian clause, which provides for economic development of the member countries.

**DANGERS ALLEGED**

So the promoters of this fantastic idea are going to try to jam through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Senate one more crisis proposal—a proposal that threatens the liberty of every American citizen.

A week ago today the United States celebrated Independence Day. On that date 180 years ago the Continental Congress adopted the immortal Declaration of Independence, by which for the first time in human history a highly intelligent people became absolutely free.

The proposal before this committee today is that the Declaration of Independence be scrapped—that immortality put on mortality. This is exactly what the pending resolution proposes, and I have had

a chance, Mr. Chairman, only to glance over the amended form, but I don't think it materially changes, I don't think it in any sense changes, what I am saying.

For, if the words of the resolution mean anything, they mean that the President shall invite Ambassadors of the sponsors of the original North Atlantic Treaty to come together to explore and report how they can set up a supergovernment—which is somewhat euphemistically called in the resolution “a political union.”

I am told that among psychologists one of the most interesting phenomena is suicide. Why do individuals sometimes destroy themselves.

The subject of why nations destroy themselves is of at least equal interest.

#### NATO DEBATES

I have been going through the debates in the Senate, July 20 and 21, 1949, about 88 pages, I think, on the question of the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty. Again and again was stressed the point that NATO would be purely military—purely for defense.

I find not a word in the treaty itself that would indicate any expectation—not even a suspicion—that at any future time the organization called NATO would be used, or that anyone would assert that it should be used, for any other purpose than defense.

I find one hint on page 9818 of the debate of July 20 which reads:

The obligations of national defense and advancing the welfare of its people are inherent in any government.

But even these words, which are found in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee accompanying the submission of the treaty to the Senate in 1949, would appear to be merely a generality covering the purposes for which all governments are set up.

To emphasize the point I am making, I find the following in this same committee report:

The treaty in letter and in spirit is purely defensive. It is directed against no one; it is directed solely against aggression.

Yet on April 23, 1956, Secretary Dulles said:

The time has come to advance NATO \* \* \* to the totality of its meaning \* \* \*. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring the possibilities which now beckon us forward.

What's this about “the totality of its meaning”? What has happened since July 1949 to add to the meaning of the plain language of the NATO Treaty?

I realize, of course, that reference is made in the treaty to the Charter of the U. N. But when the U. N. Charter itself was under debate in 1945, it was not disclosed to the American people that the U. N. and its specialized agencies would presently undertake to assert authority over the domestic affairs of the United States, which idea several decisions of American courts have supported.

In other words, it would appear that concealment and fraud were practiced by the authors of the U. N. Charter against the American people and against the Senate, just as they are now being practiced with respect to the NATO agreement.

## NATO WEAKNESSES

In both U. N. and NATO there was a hidden purpose to bring the domestic affairs and the sovereignty of the United States under the control of an international agency.

NATO has not been the success that its advocates asserted it would be. From traveling considerably in Europe each year since World War II, or 1947, anyway, I find that other countries do not take NATO as seriously as we do.

NATO headquarters is in Paris; yet France has sent a large part of her NATO troops to north Africa to defend her colonies when it was intended they would be retained in Europe for defense against a possible Soviet attack.

Britain, in a recent meeting of the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth, agreed that little time should be lost by any of the members in the recognizing of Red China by all members of the Commonwealth.

One of the charter members of NATO was Iceland, which certainly is a strategic piece of land in the defense of the West against the Soviets. Yet within recent weeks Icelandic leaders have told the United States to abandon its \$150 million base constructed in Iceland—with Iceland's consent—for the defense of the NATO countries, including Iceland, and to get out.

Incidentally, we have heard on the strength of what is more than rumor, that a large part of Iceland's objection to the presence of American troops is caused by the United States units putting into effect in Iceland, as elsewhere, the integration of white and Negro troops.

These and other facts show that NATO has been to a large extent a failure—militarily. Many of the other nations are not playing their part.

So now it is proposed that that which has been in large part a failure be expanded and developed into a supergovernment—on the theory, perhaps, that that which in a small dose has been a failure, in a large dose would be a success.

## OPPOSITION TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Mr. Chairman, we of the National Economic Council, representing members scattered widely over the country, are overwhelmingly opposed to this resolution. The United States has lost face throughout the world because of indecision, because of weakness, because of reckless throwing around of money. It is everyday comment that our billions have bought, not good will, but distrust and suspicion.

What earthly reason is there to believe that NATO, expanded into a supergovernment, would be any better for America than the other mistaken policies of the past 11 years?

Our Government has long since overreached itself. Different officials of different departments of the executive are constantly giving out contradictory statements. They are talking too much. They have carried the idea of do-goodism so far that we have become the laughing stock of many thinking people in the rest of the world.

Napoleon is supposed to have said that he would ask nothing better in an enemy than a coalition. Our high command in Washington

seems tireless in the development of ever new coalitions. I believe that that is one great reason why our foreign policy has been on the whole so disastrous in recent years.

No other country, as stated above, takes either the U. N. or NATO anywhere nearly as seriously as we do. Other nations think first of their own vital interests—and they should.

Either we are afflicted with some disease which causes us to place other nations, especially it would seem if they lean toward communism, ahead of our own, or else we have fallen into the hands of an invisible international influence that is determined to destroy America as an independent nation.

Not long ago I talked with a member of the British Parliament whom I have known for many years and who is a down-to-earth individual, thoroughly dedicated to Britain. I asked him what Britain would do if the U. N. told her to do something that the British did not think to be in Britain's interests.

He answered calmly, "We would tell the United Nations to go to hell."

Of course they would.

#### DEFINITION OF DEMOCRACY

The preamble of the resolution before this committee opens with the phrase :

Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere demands united action by the world's leading democracies. \* \* \*

And throughout the resolution the word "democracies" is used to include all countries against communism.

I think that to call the United States a democracy, along with Britain, France, Italy, and the other members nations, is one of the fundamental errors in our foreign policy, because the United States, even after the tinkering in recent years, both with the Constitution and with our laws, is still not a democracy.

In the Constitutional Convention, various forms of government were considered. Monarchy was considered, and rejected. Democracy was considered—and rejected on the ground that throughout history, so-called democracy had always failed.

Instead, the form of government adopted was that of a republic, whose characteristics are the separation of powers and the protection of the rights of minorities, neither of which provisions can be found in the constitutions and laws of other member countries. Nor can the fundamental principles of our constitutional republic be grafted into a supergovernment.

The sooner we get back to recognizing ourselves as a republic, the more quickly will our thinking become straight and dependable again. The Constitution guarantees each State not a democratic, but a republican form of government.

Julia Ward Howe did not write "The Battle Hymn of the Democracy."

The Foreign Relations Committee said July 20, 1949, in its report on NATO :

The gospel of freedom can be best spread by example.

I could not endorse any statement more wholeheartedly. Down to recent decades, the United States, with its freedom, served as an example to all the world. And the example made itself felt. We were respected throughout the world. We were true to ourselves, to our history, and to our tradition.

But in recent years we have forgotten our history and our traditions. We have departed from the warnings of George Washington. We have deserted the American Republic. We have abandoned the setting forth of a good example.

We have tried to buy other nations with our wealth. To the people of many of these nations we have strutted about offensively. We have not been true to ourselves.

We need fewer, not more, international commitments—fewer layers of government—reduced spending, rather than the further increase of spending this resolution would surely lead to.

Peace is important—but continued liberty is even more important. We could have peace of a kind, and still lose all liberty. By retaining liberty, we will be in the best possible position to retain peace also.

We ask the Foreign Relations Committee to reject this pending resolution.

Senator GREEN (presiding). As I understand it, you have already made the request that in view of the number of persons who are seeking to address us this morning, that they limit their remarks to 10 minutes.

Senator HUMPHREY. At least to limit their remarks.

Senator GREEN. I think it ought to be understood that all the Senators here want to attend the Senate session, which convenes at 12; and if they each have 10 minutes, under my arithmetic, that will not be possible.

Senator HUMPHREY. I asked them just to limit them, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GREEN. That is the limit.

Senator HUMPHREY. I did not set any time, as I recall.

Senator GREEN. It has been suggested to me that perhaps lengthy addresses would be inserted in the record of the meeting. Has that been repeated by you?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, it has, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GREEN. Then we will proceed with the next witness, and it is Mrs. Ralph Hacker, of West Englewood, N. J.

It has been called to my attention that there are some of the gentlemen here on the dais who might wish to ask questions.

Senator HUMPHREY. I have no questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. I have none.

Senator GREEN. Then we will proceed to hear Mrs. Ralph Hacker, of West Englewood, N. J., who will present a statement of Mrs. John R. Wiborg, of Tacoma, Wash.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. MYRA C. HACKER, WEST ENGLEWOOD, N. J.  
(PRESENTING STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN R. WIBORG, OF  
TACOMA, WASH.)**

Mrs. HACKER. Senator Green, distinguished Senators, I am Myra C. Hacker, of National Pro America.

Senator GREEN. Will you be glad to answer any questions that are suggested?



Mrs. HACKER. On my own statement; yes, sir.

Senator GREEN. I did not know whether you wished merely to confine yourself to reading the statement.

Mrs. HACKER. If I can, I shall.

Senator GREEN. If you are going to do that, I was going to suggest that you only read parts of it and put the whole statement in the record.

Mrs. HACKER. I intended to read only parts of it, sir.

Senator GREEN. Yes.

Mrs. HACKER. Yes, sir.

The National Association of Pro America wishes to reaffirm its support of the policy contained in its resolution opposing the Atlantic Exploratory Convention, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Hazel Wiborg, of Tacoma, Wash., wishes to reaffirm her support of the policy of National Pro America opposing the Atlantic Exploratory Convention, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, and wishes to read into the record at this time short statements of California, Texas, and Oklahoma State Chapters of National Association of Pro America, opposing the Atlantic Exploratory Convention, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

I shall read one excerpt of Mrs. Wiborg's statement in which she states:

We, the mothers and grandmothers of America, are thinking as we have never thought before. We find it both laudable and understandable that our lawmakers are struggling to find ways and means to outlaw war and to keep the peace of the world; but we submit to you that, though death may be the last enemy it is not the worst enemy. To undermine and perchance to destroy the greatest plan and pattern of government ever known to men would be a far worse thing than death.

(Mrs. Wiborg's prepared statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN R. WIBORG, TACOMA 7, WASH.

As an American citizen, invited to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I wish to make a statement opposing a federal union of the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

I should like to say that I find it strangely anomalous that a committee of the greatest and most respected body of lawmakers in the world, the United States Senate, should give time and inclination to explore the formation of a superstate such as Atlantic union—and entailing surrender of our sovereignty, violation of our Constitution and interference with our internal laws. And I speak for thousands of Americans, who, like me, have entrusted to our elected representatives the sacred task of keeping this God-given pattern of Government safe and secure.

The surrender of our sovereignty demanded by such a convention as is proposed here would transfer decisions concerning American security and welfare from our own citizens to foreign powers and/or persons. The proportion of Socialists and Communists among the NATO countries is large and in an Atlantic Union would outvote the proponents of free enterprise and its fruitage—free man.

I am opposed to an experiment which jeopardizes our economic and political pattern—if my neighbor has cockroaches in her house will I help her by getting a few cockroaches in my house? No. But I can help her by setting an example of cleanliness and sanitation. The world needs the power and the assurance of a good example. We have it here in the American standard of government. Let us keep it for the whole world's sake.

We, the mothers and grandmothers of America, are thinking as we have never thought before. We find it both laudable and understandable that our lawmakers are struggling to find ways and means to outlaw war and to keep the peace of the world; but we submit to you that, though death may be the last

enemy it is not the worst enemy. To undermine and perchance to destroy the greatest plan and pattern of government ever known to men would be a far worse thing than death.

The Senate of the United States, elected by the citizens of the United States, has found means for proper controls among nations—and will find them in the future as events demand. In the meantime, is not the United States itself the greatest control the world has to stop aggressions and oppressions? We believe that it is. No supergovernments are needed.

Mrs. HACKER. May I read those statements into the record?

Senator GREEN. Yes.

#### POINTS IN OPPOSITION

Mrs. HACKER. National Association of Pro American, by Myra C. Hacker, summary of points in opposition to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Atlantic Exploratory Convention Stepping Stone for America's Destruction: Atlantic Exploratory Convention proposes the strengthening of NATO to extend its control beyond military requirements and into the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our lives. If this scheme succeeds we will be trapped into an international state in which the United States will be the guarantor not only of the security of England and France but all the colonies of England, France, Holland, and Belgium all over the world.

It would be a plan to insure us being a part of every quarrel, every shooting affair in the world, by joining our great Republic to the decadent and crumbling empires of Old World states.

Behind the alluring facade of Atlantic Union is the grim reality that this road, like all world-government schemes, would lead to the enslavement of the American people in an international state to which the United States would have relinquished its sovereignty for all time.

A convention to inquire into the means of furthering a federal union of the so-called Western Democracies is not as harmless as it sounds. It is based upon a prior assumption that such a union is desirable.

If Congress votes for American participation in such an assembly, it will have jumped the major issue and will have acknowledged, by implication, and in default of discussion, that it wishes to give over to an international body many of the economic, military, and political functions which have heretofore been lodged in the American people and their duly elected representatives.

Under cover, with virtually no discussion in the public press or other means of communication, the Atlantic Unionists are trying to hand away our prosperity, our freedom, and our rights as Americans over the back fence to an anonymous group of international schemers whose countries have neither our economic stability nor our concepts of political and civil rights.

The United States, which has been the strongest bulwark in the world against communism, would surrender its rights of independent decision to a set of partners whose own internal governments have been in constant danger of Communist coups.

In the proposed world government the United States could be outvoted many times. If we can't do anything with these countries now, consider our position in a political union. Just think of being in a

political union with France, with her constant changing governments, and the age-old problems of colonialism of many of the Atlantic Union communities. It would mean the complete liquidation of our American constitutional system, the complete abrogation of our tariff law, our immigration quotas, and lowering of our standards of living beyond all contemplation, and taxation of even more astronomical proportions. A common economy would liquidate our free-enterprise system and we would have to give up all our standards of material well-being and gains of labor made in the last 100 years.

For tomorrow's children we would have to close the door on America's great contribution to living—opportunity.

#### ATLANTIC UNION WEAKNESSES

Proponents of this embryonic world government promise peace and a bulwark against communism. There is no actual or historical justification that an imposed form of world government would bring peace; rather, an invitation to endless wars and civil strife on a scale never before contemplated.

National wars would be displaced by civil wars. We would have half the world in total war against the other half. If one of the groups were compelled to come in or stay in, you would have endless war against the ruling authority.

Today many parts of the world have had little experience in self-government. Free institutions could not be thrust upon them. Historic liberties are best preserved when the individual is not lost in such a vast entity as Atlantic Union.

Rights of individuals seem less important when distance from seat of government lengthens.

This resolution fails to take into account one of the greatest resistant forces to communism in this century—the driving force of nationalism or patriotism. This spirit of devotion to one's country is manifesting itself in many forms through the entire world.

In Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America, from Iceland to Poland, to Cyprus, to northern Africa, through Indonesia and the Philippines, we find a deep and burning desire for freedom and independence. This type of proposal is a frustration of the spirit of those who would be free.

As a nation we have and will always practice world cooperation through constitutional means. We will not freely surrender our sovereignty and independence when our associates will never surrender theirs. This has been illustrated all too frequently in recent years, as in the case of the failure to form a federation of Europe, and in England's determination to keep all NATO bases off Cyprus.

History is not without her example of hard-fought fields when the banner of liberty has floated in triumph, but she has few examples of a people whose dearly bought treasure has been wisely employed and safely handed down.

Last week, July 4, we celebrated the 180th anniversary of our country's freedom. Our country, born in the travail of tyranny, must remain, under God's providence, forever free and independent. Alien ideologies are reaching out to choke God-given liberty.

Proponents of Concurrent Resolution 12 fail to realize that our Nation's wealth, its influence, its internal happiness, are envied and resented abroad by the very countries we seek to help, and that there is at least one great foreign power whose basic philosophy impels it to world domination and the concomitant destruction of our Nation and our way of life. And that power is not restrained by any Christian principles of charity or American ideals of honor.

The language of the Atlantic Union resolution certainly contradicts the language of the Declaration of Independence. It is truly surprising to find some of our representatives entertaining a move to ally our country politically with foreign nations.

My distinguished Senators, preserve our American ideals of individual rights and individual freedoms as embodied in the most fundamentally sound and most permanent Constitution in the history of government. For those American principles of government, above party and personality, I am sure we can count on your determined support. On those principles we shall never surrender—so that the liberty that was yours, was mine, and must be our children's, will be preserved in this generation.

Senator GREEN. Thank you, Mrs. Hacker.

Would you prefer to have—you read extracts from this paper by Mrs. Wiborg. Would you prefer to have the entire manuscript of hers substituted for the extracts you have read?

Mrs. HACKER. Well, I was hoping, inasmuch as we represent also the chapters of Oklahoma, California, that we might have our statement, both of our statements, and that of Texas, read into the record. The statements are very short, sir.

Senator GREEN. Very well, that will be done.

Mrs. HACKER. Thank you, sir.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

#### STEPPING STONE FOR AMERICA'S DESTRUCTION

#### SUMMARY OF POINTS IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 12 FOR NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRO AMERICA

By Myra C. Hacker, West Englewood, N. J.

The National Association of Pro America wishes to reaffirm its support of the policy contained in duly adopted National Association Pro America resolution opposing the Atlantic Exploratory Convention (S. Con. Res. No. 12). Resolution attached.

#### I

Atlantic Exploratory Convention proposes the strengthening of NATO to extend its control beyond military requirements and into the political, economic and cultural aspects of our lives. If this scheme succeeds we will be trapped into an international state in which the United States will be the guarantor not only of the security of England and France but all the colonies of England, France, Holland and Belgium all over the world. It would be a plan to insure us being a part of every quarrel, every shooting affair in the world by joining our great Republic to the decadent and crumbling empires of Old World states. Behind the alluring facade of Atlantic Union is the grim reality that this road like all world government schemes would lead to the enslavement of the American people in an international state to which the United States would have relinquished its sovereignty for all time.

#### II

A convention to inquire into the means of furthering a Federal union of the so-called Western Democracies is not as harmless as it sounds. It is based upon a prior assumption that such a union is desirable. If Congress votes for Amer-

ican participation in such an assembly it will have jumped the major issue and will have knowledged by implication, and in default of discussion, that it wishes to give over to an international body many of the economic, military, and political functions which have heretofore been lodged in the American people and their duly elected representatives. We have already seen in the Korean tragedy, to what lengths of personal misfortune and national ineptness such a surrender of American rights to a supranational group can lead us.

### III

What would this Government's powers be? Would this supergovernment control such matters as declaration of war, the collection of taxes for war purposes, or the allocation of each nation's share, and the number of men each nation is to furnish? Remember our experience in Korea. Did we learn anything there where our boys fought a war they were not permitted to win, and where we provided more than 90 percent of the men and material?

### IV

The existence of a desire to design an ideal blueprint for a postwar world is obvious, but planning for the future at best is difficult and when planning proceeds without relation to understanding, it becomes not merely difficult but dangerous to what is best in our established order.

America has everything to lose and nothing at all to gain from such a union. The analogy with the Thirteen Colonies after the Revolutionary War (which gave us our independence against European domination) is ridiculous. Geographically, economically, militarily, each of the Thirteen Colonies then needed each of the others to survive and even then there was the widest public discussion before any one of the States ratified for itself the then new Constitution. Now we are strong, self-sufficient, and possessed of a stable representative government under a Constitution which guarantees the rights of its citizens to self-government and to a happy and prosperous life within the law.

### V

Under cover, with virtually no discussion in the public press or other means of communication, the Atlantic Unionists are trying to hand away our prosperity, our freedom, and our rights as Americans over the back fence to an anonymous group of international schemers whose countries have neither our economic stability nor our concepts of political and civil rights. How can Americans possibly be interested in such a deal?

### VI

The Founding Fathers of this Nation differed in religious creeds but were united in their political philosophy which in turn was based on certain fundamental religious principles that they held in common.

It was the belief in God with its resultant corollaries which produced the United States, with its God-given freedoms, inalienable rights, and material prosperity. If our freedoms and prosperity are to be preserved, we shall have to know, understand, and perpetuate the principles which gave us birth.

There are five basic principles to be found in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence. They are:

1. Belief in God.
2. Belief that all men are created equal.
3. Belief in God-given inalienable rights.
4. Belief that the function of civil government is to secure those rights.
5. Belief in a natural moral law which is the basis for all human law and to which all human law must conform.

The American concept of government is the fulfillment of these basic principles.

### VII

The American soldier of World War I and World War II fought for this same American ideal. They offered their lives to stop tyranny and totalitarianism, to preserve the American ideals of individual rights and individual freedoms as embodied in the most fundamentally sound and most permanent Constitution in the history of government.

What would happen to the ideals for which these American boys sacrificed themselves if we commit ourselves further to Atlantic Union? The Atlantic Union people themselves admit that their scheme would eliminate America's independence. That's the purpose of Atlantic Union. The former president of Atlantic Union Committee (former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts) in testimony, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950 admitted that in joining Atlantic Union, the United States Government would have to surrender its rights and power to coin money, to levy taxes, and tariffs, to regulate immigration, to enact citizenship laws, to declare war, and to maintain standing armies.

## VIII

The United States which has been the strongest bulwark in the world against communism would surrender its rights of independent decision to a set of partners whose own internal governments have been in constant danger of Communist coups.

Some of the nations we are irrevocably proposing to join and hence scrap our Constitution have already recognized Communist China and are well-known Communist appeasers and are consistently pressuring us to recognize Communist China and desert Formosa.

## IX

The two principal European nations, England and France, already have independent economic and military pacts with Russia, our chief political enemy, which read surprisingly like the Atlantic pact they signed with us. England has recognized Communist China and from the beginning furnished rubber, tin, and steel to the Communists to fight our boys in Korea.

## X

In the proposed World Government the United States could be outvoted many times. If we can't do anything with these countries now, consider our position in a political union. Just think of being in a political union with France with her constant changing governments, and the age-old problems of colonialism of many of the Atlantic Union communities which will take centuries to solve. It would mean the complete liquidation of our American constitutional system, the complete abrogation of our tariff law, our immigration quotas, and lowering of our standards of living beyond all contemplation and taxation of even more astronomical proportions. A common economy would liquidate our free enterprise system and we would have to give up all our standards of material well-being and gains of labor made in the last 100 years. For tomorrow's children we would have to close the door on America's great contribution to living—opportunity.

We would be bound by the decisions of Europeans whose fundamental philosophies of government are almost exactly opposite from ours.

## XI

While Congress and State legislatures, under our system, act as agents of the people in considering constitutional amendments, their ability to transfer to surrender the powers of the people of the United States to a state outside the political limits of the Nation is in considerable doubt.

Article V of the United States Constitution alone could stop the procedure. It reads as follows: "\* \* \* \* no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Under this circumstance one State alone in the United States of America could halt or veto a move toward relinquishing sovereignty if such a change in our present Federal structure like Atlantic Union was contemplated.

The American Constitution is built on the basic principle of limited government—our unity and strength as a free people have come not from the positive powers conferred by our Constitution, so much as from restrictions imposed by that Constitution (namely Bill of Rights) which is essentially negative, telling Government what it cannot do, chaining the Government down to prevent it from invading the God-given rights of men. This concept is uniquely American and is the primary reason for the great spiritual and material development of America.

## XII

Note the word "explore" in resolution. The title this year has a new terminology but the basic idea of the resolution is the same. We have a deceptive title on a resolution with a deadly purpose (to abolish the American Republic).

The word "explore" is an example of camouflage to deceive the people. Just how much sense does it make to call a convention to explore the possibility of destroying our sovereignty, our constitutional rights, and our Republic?

It would be the equivalent of calling a convention to see how we, as a people, could best commit suicide.

On this important constitutional issue like all World Government problems the major information channels and press representatives have had little to say. The historical blackout reigns supreme when any and all World Government schemes are introduced in Congress or State legislatures. Why are our media of communications so strangely silent when matters like Atlantic Union should have the fullest and widest amount of public discussion? Are the proponents of these fantastic plans afraid to let the people actually know the enormous complications and implications of their World Government schemes? Beware of paper planners who try to lift an imaginary citizenry to a visionary Utopia.

## XIII

America can best serve the cause of freedom at home and abroad by maintaining its independence under its own principles of constitutional government. Thus it may not only continue to pursue unhampered and unentangled, its own destiny as a just and prosperous Nation, but may also lend a helping hand and set a steadying example for the nations less stable and less fortunate. An America shackled by the domination of foreign ideologies and hamstrung by the weakness of European economies can be of little use to itself or to the world at large.

## XIV

Proponents of this embryonic World Government promise peace and a bulwark against communism. There is no actual or historical justification that an imposed form of World Government would bring peace; rather an invitation to endless wars and civil strife on a scale never before contemplated. National wars would be displaced by civil wars. We would have half the world in total war against the other half. If one of the groups were compelled to come in or stay in, you would have endless war against the ruling authority. Today many parts of the world have had little experience in self-government. Free institutions could not be thrust upon them. Historic liberties are best preserved when the individual is not lost in such a vast entity as Atlantic Union. Rights of individuals seem less important when distance from seat of government lengthens.

## XV

This resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, completely overlooks one of the greatest resistant forces to communism in this century—the driving force of nationalism or patriotism. This spirit of devotion to one's country is manifesting itself in many forms throughout the entire world. Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America are feeling its throbbing passionate pulse, translated into action against all forms of colonialism and foreign domination. From Iceland to Poland, to Cyprus, to northern Africa through Indonesia to the Philippines we find a deep and burning desire for freedom and independence. This type of proposal is a frustration of the spirit of those who would be free.

## XVI

As a nation we have and will practice world cooperation through constitutional means. We have always been ready to care for the stricken and unfortunate in every corner of the world. Gladly will we aid suffering humanity through constitutional means.

We will not freely surrender our sovereignty and independence when many of our associates will never surrender theirs. This has been illustrated all too frequently in recent years, that is, the failure to form a federation of Europe and in England's determination to keep all NATO bases off Cyprus.



## XVII

Freedom and liberty are two of mankind's most poignant aspirations. Under our Federal Constitution liberty for the first time became an actuality. An eminent British economist once paid us the compliment of saying that the American people were the only people who "thought of an ideal first and then built a state around it." Liberty is the chief jewel of civilization and the one most easily lost.

History is not without her examples of hard-fought fields when the banner of liberty has floated in triumph but she has few examples of a people whose dear-bought treasure has been wisely employed and safely handed down.

## XVIII

Last week, July 4, we celebrated the 180th anniversary of our country's freedom. Our country, born in the travail of tyranny, must remain under God's providence, forever free and independent. Alien ideologies are reaching out to choke God-given liberty of more and more independent nations. Proponents of concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, do not realize that our Nation's wealth, its influence, its internal happiness are envied and resented abroad by the very countries we seek to help; and that there is at least one great foreign power whose basic philosophy impels it to world domination and the concomitant destruction of our Nation and our way of life. And that power is not restrained by any Christian principles of charity or American ideals of honor.

## XIX

The language of the Atlantic Union resolution certainly contradicts the language of the Declaration of Independence. It is truly surprising to find some of our Representatives entertaining a move to ally our country politically with foreign nations and contemplating with indifference our loss of essential sovereignty.

## XX

Distinguished Senators, preserve our American ideals of individual rights and individual freedoms as embodied in the most fundamentally sound and most permanent Constitution in the history of government. For those American principles of government above party and personality, I am sure we can count on your determined support. On these principles we shall never surrender. So that the liberty that was yours, was mine, and must be our children's will be preserved in this generation.

---

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRO-AMERICA RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO  
ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION ADOPTED 1955

Whereas Pro America stands for sovereignty of the United States and the preservation of our Constitution and our form of government; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the United States Senate a concurrent resolution known as the Atlantic Union Resolution, which provides for a Federal convention to be called for the purpose of exploring the formation, within the framework of the United Nations, of a federal union of the North Atlantic Treaty countries as the convention may invite to send delegates; and

Whereas United States membership in such a union would entail surrender of our sovereignty, violation of our Constitution, and interference with our internal laws; and

Whereas such an exploratory convention would have as one of its objectives the surrender of American sovereignty: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the National Association of Pro America opposes the Atlantic Exploratory Convention (S. Con. Res. 12).

---

PRO AMERICA,  
CALIFORNIA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN,  
*San Francisco, Calif., June 18, 1956.*

Mrs. RALPH HACKER,  
*1545 Warwick, West Englewood, N. J.*

DEAR MRS. HACKER: The California chapter, Pro America, wishes to reaffirm its support of policy contained in duly adopted National Association Pro America



resolution in 1955, as follows, opposing the Atlantic Exploratory Convention (S. Con. Res. 12) :

"Whereas Pro America stands for sovereignty of the United States and the preservation of our Constitution and our form of government; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in the United States Senate a concurrent resolution known as the Atlantic Union Resolution, which provides for a Federal convention to be called for the purpose of exploring the formation, within the framework of the United Nations, of a federal union of the North Atlantic Treaty countries as the convention may invite to send delegates; and

"Whereas United States membership in such a union would entail surrender of our sovereignty, violation of our Constitution, and interference with our internal laws; and

"Whereas such an exploratory convention would have as one of its objectives the surrender of American sovereignty : Therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That the National Association of Pro America opposes the Atlantic Exploratory Convention (S. Con. Res. 12)."*

You have our State chapter's full support and cooperation in presenting Pro America's opposition to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, hearings on which we understand are to commence before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 20, 1956.

Sincerely,

FREDA KLUSSMAN  
Mrs. Hans Klussman,  
*Legislative Chairman.*

PRO AMERICA,  
OKLAHOMA CHAPTER,  
*Oklahoma City, Okla., July 6, 1956.*

DEAR MYRA : The Oklahoma chapter presented the resolution opposing Atlantic Union Resolution in 1955, and it was unanimous. Resolution attached.

IRENE CHEATHAM.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *July 7, 1956.*

Mrs. RALPH HACKER :

Texas requests that you represent us at hearings on Atlantic Union, which we know is gravest threat our United States Constitution has ever faced. Anything we can do to help you we will.

Mrs. W. D. WALTMAN, Jr.,  
*Texas State President, Pro America.*

Senator GREEN. Are there any questions to ask?

Senator SPARKMAN. No.

Senator HUMPHREY. What is the membership of your organization?

Mrs. HACKER. I am sorry, sir, that is something that we do not give out. I mean, I am not empowered to——

Senator HUMPHREY. Is it nationwide, I mean?

Mrs. HACKER. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Several States?

Mrs. HACKER. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Or more?

Mrs. HACKER. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

Mrs. HACKER. If you wish a statement from the national organization, I will have to forward it.

Senator HUMPHREY. It is not necessary. I just wanted the scope of the membership, the areas covered.

Mrs. HACKER. Yes, sir. It covers most of the country.

Thank you, sir.

Senator GREEN. The next witness is Mrs. William H. Hardie, of Short Hills, N. J., representing the New Jersey chapter of Pro America, Inc., West Orange, N. J.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. JESSIE HARDIE, SHORT HILLS, N. J., NEW JERSEY CHAPTER OF PRO AMERICA, INC., WEST ORANGE, N. J.**

Mrs. HARDIE. Senator Green and gentlemen, I am Mrs. Jessie Hardie, of Short Hills, N. J. I am a member of the bar of the State of New York, and I am a barrister-at-law of the Middle Temple, London, England.

For the past 10 years I have been an active member of the New Jersey chapter of Pro America, which I represent here today in opposing Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

On the 4th of July, I received notice of the date of this hearing, and so I turned to close study of the text of the resolution which Senator Smith of New Jersey had sent me a few days before.

It was a very curious task to undertake while my children were outdoors celebrating Independence Day. I am very surprised at the status of this draft resolution which has just been handed to me, inasmuch as Senator Smith did supply me such a short time ago with the printed copy which was introduced on February 9 of 1955.

Now I am unwilling to believe that this draft resolution has any status whatever, and that this committee is obliged to consider it. Am I correct in that? This draft resolution has evidently been recently mimeographed. I understand it has not been introduced; is that so?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mrs. HARDIE. And, therefore, if this draft resolution can be produced, further draft resolutions can be produced and substituted, and this thing can be modified and modified and modified.

**THE REVISED RESOLUTION**

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, that would apply not only to a draft resolution. It would apply just as well to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. As a matter of fact, we ordinarily hold hearings on some particular resolution that is before us. But after the hearings are complete and the committee sits around the table, it can prepare any language that it sees fit to do. So I do not think your point is well taken.

It is true, as Senator Humphrey stated in the beginning, that this draft resolution, as a suggested redraft, was prepared, oh, several weeks ago.

Senator HUMPHREY. It has been discussed on two occasions.

Senator SPARKMAN. It has been discussed.

Mrs. HARDIE. Is it possible Senator Smith of New Jersey was not aware that a modified draft had been substituted for this?

Senator HUMPHREY. We have a resolution before us, on which we try to gain testimony by listening to the pros and the cons. As a result of that testimony, we may consider altering the resolution.

We have had hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 before. As a result of those hearings some people who were interested in this kind of resolution prepared modifications.

There have been several modifications, the most recent of which you have. It has no legal standing at all before the committee. It is merely a suggested proposal which certain members who were sponsors of the original resolution thought the hearings up to date revealed as justifiable changes.

Mrs. HARDIE. I don't want this taken out of my 10 minutes, please.

Senator HUMPHREY. No, you take your 10 minutes.

Mrs. HARDIE. Then I am correct in assuming that the printed copy which Senator Smith of New Jersey sent to me is the resolution on which you are hearing opposition and support; is that correct?

Senator GREEN. That is correct.

Mrs. HARDIE. Then anything I may say with regard to this printed copy which I received from my Senator will apply to subsequent modifications, and I think, I gather from this modified draft, that they will all be of much the same character.

#### CRITICISM OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

This resolution, and I refer to this printed copy, is vaguely drawn. It is loose in definition and it is flowery. It is based on five premises which successively distort the truth, beg the question, state facts which prove nothing, indulge in non sequitur, and drag in irrelevant matter.

The concluding proposal of this resolution introduces matter not fittingly brought before this body, because it asks the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to abdicate its responsibility in foreign affairs to an unrepresentative group.

It does this by recommending steps by which the national sovereignty of the United States may be abolished, by which the Constitution may be violated, and by which the American people will be by-passed completely in matters affecting their rights, their livelihood, and their honor.

This resolution purports to be concerned with the exploration by a very loosely defined group of people, of private individuals, of the question of close political union with certain sovereign states with whom this country is now cooperating in a military alliance for the purpose, mind you, of preserving democratic institutions.

I submit to you, gentlemen, the democratic institutions are best preserved by the vigilance of the people whose institutions they are.

I submit to you that government by elected representatives is a democratic institution, and that the unauthorized delegating away of power to persons not responsible to the electorate is a grave undermining of that democratic institution.

This resolution proposes that the fundamental question of political union, a very important question, be explored by persons appointed by the President, acting, I quote—

on their individual convictions in order to make a public report and recommendations.

By what magic, gentleman, or by what right do the individual convictions of such a loosely defined group become transformed into a public official report? By what right do the individual convictions acquire the status of recommendations deserving of any notice at all by the American people whose form of government and whose civil rights may be recommended to be wiped out?

This body, the United States Senate, of which this committee is a part, cannot morally transfer to such an appointed group the power to make recommendations touching foreign affairs, because this body, the Senate, is responsible to the electorate. It cannot relieve itself of this responsibility even by transferring it to the Chief Executive.

Neither the Senate nor the President of the United States have any mandate from the American people to deal with the question of political union. The electorate as a whole has never been faced with this issue, even the exploring of this issue. It has had no opportunity to express itself.

#### CONSULTING THE PEOPLE

The preservation of our own democratic institutions demands that such an opportunity be given the people before the Senate or before any part of it even consider this resolution.

The present Chief Executive has made it clear by his opposition to the Bricker amendment that his own convictions lie rather to keeping the door open to the question of exploring political union.

His appointments under this resolution, supposing this resolution were passed, might easily reflect that view.

Now, we would be naive to ignore existence of a small, but very dedicated group of people, known as the United World Federalists, who have worked for 10 years to bring about such a political union as this. But the American people as a whole have never been consulted on this point.

Political propriety demands that any Chief Executive or any member of the United States Senate who individually believes in a political union of this sort, stand before the electorate and ask to be defeated or elected on this issue alone.

It is such an important issue that it overrides every other one of a strictly domestic nature.

We cannot overlook the possibility of pressure being exerted on either the Chief Executive or Members of the Congress who would have the appointing of the individuals to go to this convention, and they are to act, remember, as individuals.

Now, has any one of you gentlemen ever asked yourself what is the ultimate conclusion possible of the steps of which this resolution is merely the entering wedge?

#### PRESERVATION OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

The end result might be the loss of American independence. Now, independence is self-government, and it is a democratic institution, and this resolution is concerned with the preservation of democratic institutions.

In 1776, Britain had democratic institutions. They had representative government. They had a two-party system. They had democratic control of taxation, of the public purse. There were safeguards against military dictatorship, and there was a Bill of Rights. But none of these gave the American Colonies what they wanted.

They wanted self-government, and they could only acquire that by acquiring their independence and by severing political union such as this resolution proposes rejoining.

Lest you suppose that what was objectionable in 1776 is unobjectionable in 1956, let us examine two features of the British political system now. The upper house is composed of the sons of gentlemen who served well previous heads of state. If that practice prevailed in this country today, some of you wouldn't be here.

Now, second, the representatives in the lower house in Britain do not have to be residents of the localities they represent. They are imposed on the constituencies by a highly centralized political machine. If that system prevailed here, many of you wouldn't be in the Senate.

Now, if the committee favors this resolution before it, and faces the voters with their responsibility for voting for it in November, maybe by next summer many of you won't be here.

If this resolution should lead to further steps and this convention might lead to the constructing of a supranational parliament, the United States Senate would be so completely superseded in the field of domestic relations that none of you would need to be here.

What becomes of the Committee on Foreign Relations? The very term "foreign relations," and the word "international," presupposes that there are free, independent, sovereign states who are able to deal with each other; and members of a close political union are not foreign to each other, they are not international with respect to each other.

They are tied, and they no longer deal with each other. They are absolutely hindered.

It would be too bad if this committee were the instrument of the extinction of its own power over foreign affairs.

#### ATLANTIC UNION CONSIDERED UNDESIRABLE

You gentlemen may be familiar with the final scene of Gilbert and Sullivan's *Iolanthe*, where the insertion of the single word "not" solved the entire problem. I submit to you that of the five premises in this Senate concurrent resolution, the whereas, 1, 3, and 5, would make better sense if the single word "not" were inserted.

No. 1. Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere does not demand united action, and so forth; it demands, rather, that the people whose democratic institutions they are, be vigilant and see that they are kept in their hands.

No. 3. Whereas it is not essential to determine by what means the democracies can further unify their efforts, and so on. That is not the essential thing. The essential thing is to make the present military alliance more successful and to make it work.

No. 5. Whereas it is not desirable that this problem be considered by delegates who would act in accordance with their individual convictions. I maintain their individual convictions have nothing to do with the fate of the American people. This should be a matter to be presented to the American people, and let them present their views.

I want to answer once and for all the argument of the United World Federalists when they say, "Well, what else can we do? What would you put in its place?"

Gentlemen, we have military alliances, we have our independence.

During the lifetime of this Republic, the threat of world empire, which is creating the present crisis, has appeared before: Under Napoleon, and twice from Germany, under the Kaiser and under Hitler; and both times in these recent world wars we have successfully kept our independence, and we have kept our democratic institutions, and we have not had to indulge in political union with our allies.

And we are still free to continue our course wherever the threat of world empire comes from.

Premise No. 2 quotes from the NATO Treaty, but it does not by any means follow from that that political union is a necessary step.

Premise No. 4 states that the addition of the German Federal Republic to NATO makes this resolution more timely. Gentlemen, as the Mad Hatter said at Alice's tea party, "You can't have more tea if you haven't had any tea."

The resolution is not timely and, therefore, it cannot be more timely. It is not timely; the steps which it proposes are completely unauthorized and unconstitutional.

The steps it proposes tend to destroy democratic institutions, not to preserve them, and therefore it is the duty of this committee in preserving the national sovereignty of the United States, and in defending the Constitution, to reject Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Senator GREEN. Thank you, Mrs. Hardie, very much.

Are there any questions?

Senator SPARKMAN. No questions.

Senator GREEN. If not, you are excused.

The next witness is Mrs. J. H. Williams, of Ridgewood, N. J., representing the Northern New Jersey Study Group.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. LILLIAN C. WILLIAMS, NORTHERN NEW JERSEY STUDY GROUP, RIDGEWOOD, N. J.**

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Senator Green and Members of the Committee, before I begin, I would like to say—

Senator GREEN. You may stand or sit down, as you prefer.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

I picked up our copy of Concurrent Resolution 12 at the Senate documents room on June 25 of this year, barely 3 weeks ago, and was told at that time that that was the most recent copy available. Hence, my remarks are based on it.

My name is Lillian C. Williams, and I reside at Ridgewood, N. J. I am presenting this statement on behalf of the Northern New Jersey Study Group.

I consider it an honor and a privilege to present my statement before your distinguished committee.

Today the world atmosphere is charged with the fire of independence and liberty. Nation after nation seeks to cast off the yoke of foreign domination. The Soviet satellites grow restive.

This is not a strange phenomenon. It is but a belated manifestation of our own reaction so vigorously expressed in 1776. It is not a sign of a sick world, but rather of one coming to life, to a new and good life of equality with and independence of the other nations of this globe.

The principle of independence is not wrong. It was not wrong in 1776 and is not wrong today. The right to self-government is a God-given right as true today as it ever was or ever will be. It belongs to all peoples through all ages. Truth is not relative—it cannot change and remain truth.

The men who founded this Republic, still the freest nation in the world, established it with the intent that we as a free and independent people carry high the banner of these twin truths, independence and liberty, and shed their light wherever we make contact with our fellow-men.

Not always have we heeded the call. There have been, and tragically there will always be, faithless leaders unwittingly chosen by our people, leaders who, although charged with the obligation of a dedication to the ideals of liberty and independence for all, nevertheless through an overweening desire to please some alien-thinking despot have tossed overboard these twin beacons to man's right to happiness via liberty and independence.

With these thoughts in mind we approached our study of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, and found on the face of it a harmless-sounding document, but one loaded with dire potentialities.

#### EFFECTS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

The majority of the American people are completely uninformed on the principles of Atlantic Union and what this proposed implementation would mean for them. It is a matter which should have been subjected to the fullest and widest amount of public discussion before presentation to Congress in a formal resolution as found in Concurrent Resolution 12.

The people do not know that with the passage of this resolution, with its subsequent possibilities, how easily their sovereignty will slip away. They would not realize the chaos resulting from the inability to make their own decisions.

Stripped from them their right to coin money, to control taxation, to rule on immigration, to regulate tariffs, to control their sons in the armed services, with the powers of their President and elected representatives curtailed and limited, the American people would indeed be a tragic symbol of a betrayal of all our beloved war dead fought and died for.

The secrecy via the press, radio, and television shrouding this pending legislation betokens a callous disregard for the American citizen and his ability to make intelligent decisions.

The passage of this resolution will be tantamount to approval of some form of union, inasmuch as this is but the one point to be explored. With the accomplishment of this, it will then be too late to recall the stirring words of Thomas Jefferson in his inaugural address, "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

The recently adopted House Joint Resolution 501 manifests the step-by-step trend toward implementation of the so-called Exploratory Resolution No. 12.

#### DIFFICULTIES IN ATLANTIC UNION

While the preamble to this resolution No. 12 appears innocuous to the casual reader, its suggested implementation has dangerous implications; notably, the inclusion of members of various political parties among which there is a large Communist representation such as we find in Italy, France, and, all too recently, Iceland.

The recognition of totalitarian Red China, the brutal keepers of our apparently deserted American prisoners, by several of the Atlantic democracies which would be invited to this exploratory convention, would indeed present an insurmountable barrier to mutual cooperation.

We would like at this point respectfully to request what Mr. Dulles and the State Department mean by the statement now so bandied about but still entirely unexplained:

The time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning.

This great country of ours needs no convention to explore the possible formation of a federation to further peace on this globe. Our faith in Divine guidance, our inherent love of freedom and independence for all, our generous willingness to meet our fellow humans more than halfway, our eagerness to dispel the gloom of oppression and suffering wherever it may be, will in the end go a long way to securing world peace.

The feverish stabs at alliances that won't work, the halfhearted "gangings together for mutual defense," can never succeed. The loss of self-determination destroys self-respect without which a nation cannot long survive.

Repeated agitation for various forms of supraworld government shows the great and continuing need for the constitutional safeguards to be found in the principles of the Bricker and Dirksen amendments.

Surely, Senators, you will not now forget the solemn oath you took to uphold the ideals of liberty and independence written into our Constitution.

In summing up, we find the implementation of this resolution would mean the destruction of our Republic, involvement in endless problems, and, most tragic of all, the repudiation of the three great, great cornerstones of our American heritage—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our immortal Bill of Rights.

Thank you.

Senator GREEN. Are there any questions to ask Mrs. Williams?

#### ATTITUDE TOWARD NATO

Senator SPARKMAN. Let me ask Mrs. Williams just this one very brief question:

Do you believe in the establishment and maintenance of NATO?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. As I understood it in the early days, a military alliance, I had faith and had hoped that it would work; and in spite of the conflicting statements, I understand that it is not working militarily, and my faith is shaken, shaken.

Furthermore, I feel that an expansion of it would be disastrous to our country.

Senator SPARKMAN. If I interpret correctly the views that have been expressed by General Gruenther and others who have been connected with NATO, and perhaps of the present administration, it is to the effect that NATO as a great defensive structure may be threatened because of the failure to have what might be called adequate political and economic underpinning.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. We have no proof of it. We have the word of one man, a military man.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, you know that Secretary Dulles has made a proposal somewhat along that line, indicating that we needed to do something in the political and economic line.



Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, "something"—what does he mean? Is the phrase "the totality of NATO," is that what you are referring to, Senator?

Senator SPARKMAN. The arguments you present here are so similar to arguments that we heard when we had NATO under consideration, right here in this room, by the way. The Senate was meeting in this chamber at that time, and we heard similar expressions opposing the original establishment of NATO.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am afraid that very, very few American citizens understand NATO. I think it has been one of the most misunderstood or, shall I say, ununderstood. People just don't know it.

And when you speak of Atlantic Union, they stare at you. They don't know it. And after being in existence for 16 years, I cannot understand why Atlantic Union has not spread more of its doctrines, if it is such a desirable thing.

And when you ask people, the people in the street, you ask college people, you ask teachers, they don't know; they don't understand. They have no idea what Atlantic Union means, and very few of them understand NATO.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are you familiar with the Steel and Coal Community of Europe?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. My statement—the Steel—I didn't hear you.

#### EUROPEAN STEEL AND COAL COMMUNITY

Senator SPARKMAN. The Steel and Coal Community of Europe.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Oh, of Europe. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Whereby several of those countries went together for the purpose of pooling their steel and coal resources.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are you familiar with the fact that they did set up an actual government to which representatives are sent by the different countries, and that they do exercise control over the coal and steel resources of those respective countries?

Do you believe that has been a good thing, or not?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, the countries involved have not the same freedom that we have. They had very much less to lose in forming it, and possibly more to gain.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, do you feel that those governments have lost sovereignty or independence by reason of having set up the community?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I would say "Yes."

Senator SPARKMAN. Do you think that Belgium, for instance, is not a sovereign country any more, or that Luxembourg or France or West Germany are not?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Nominally, possibly, but in a federation they cannot retain their sovereignty.

Senator SPARKMAN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to say that the purpose of these hearings, of course, is to have an exchange of views. I welcome these hearings.

## SAFEGUARDING THE CONSTITUTION

I want to say that while there may be honest disagreements between some of us, I think the testimony we gain here is all very helpful, and I would hope that the lack of questions would not be interpreted as a lack of interest, because we have to expedite our time.

I just want to bring this one point up to you. I recognize the legitimate concern that people have over whether or not we would, so to speak, bargain away our much loved liberties and national independence, and all that our Constitution means to us.

I would hope that you would recognize, as other witnesses would, that no Member of Congress that I have ever met would ever enter into anything like this without the most careful of scrutiny and fullest discussion. Mind you, that is all we are doing now. We are discussing as to whether or not we should officially take notice of the express desire of some folks to have discussions over how we might effectuate and improve NATO, and the defense of the free world.

I only bring up this point so that you will not think that those who may have joined in this resolution were doing so in the feeling that this is a way to get rid of our Bill of Rights and our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, documents that are like life itself to us.

I want to point out that before anything could be done, it would require a constitutional amendment; and, believe me, that would mean something to the American people.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Senator, may I ask, the signing of the NATO Treaty makes the NATO Treaty the law of this land?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. And article II states that the nations, the signatories, not that they may, but they will work together for—

Senator HUMPHREY. Right.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Why would an amendment be needed, because we already have a law of the land that says we will work.

Senator HUMPHREY. That article II does not provide for the pooling of sovereignty, if you can pool sovereignty. It does not provide for supranational government. It recognizes the principle of national independence and the cooperation between national independent states in a NATO alliance.

The very fact that the word is "alliance" indicates that the national sovereignty is preserved.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well—

Senator HUMPHREY. I think we ought to know our terminology. I should have discussed this, possibly, with the previous witness, a lawyer, because some of us also have an understanding of law, and the word "alliance" is based, is predicated, upon national independence of nations, sovereign states.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. But with a federation of union, if that sort of union, if one was formed.

Senator HUMPHREY. But NATO does not provide for a federation.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. But it says it will provide for anything that will produce—the implication is it will produce security for the signatories, article II.

Senator HUMPHREY. Within the limitations of national sovereignty.

Senator SPARKMAN. And according to the constitutional processes of the United States.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. In article II?

Senator HUMPHREY. The whole treaty was based on that.

You see, I think that sometimes we can conjure up gremlins and goblins of international significance that are totally nonexistent, that are figments of the imagination. And, may I say, there are in this body people who have studied the Constitution and lived by it who are just as jealous of the rights of American people as any single group that can be found in this country. The whole purpose of this particular discussion on this resolution is whether or not it might be desirable—and I use the word “might,” and the word “might” is in the resolution—to have individuals discuss possibilities for the strengthening of the free institutions within the NATO community.

And now I am primarily concerned not only with the original draft because I have modified my thinking a great deal from the time of the original draft of this resolution, but with the question of whether or not we might improve, implement, strengthen NATO, and whether or not we might do this within the confines of the NATO structure.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I would think the NATO Treaty would be sufficient. It already states that we may do it. I don't see why we need added legislation.

#### NEED FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Senator HUMPHREY. I will just conclude on this: I think you made a very valid point. People do not understand it too well. I think that is very valid, and I think this is worthy of the consideration of Congress. One of the best ways for people to understand it is for people to talk and really explore into this matter to see what it is all about.

For example, I am not willing to rely entirely on the Secretary of State, no matter what Secretary of State it is, to determine what should be done about NATO. I happen to think there are other people in the country who are intelligent, also, and have points of view that might be worthwhile, and all this points up to is exploratory discussions.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. May I suggest that I think you make a very good point about the possibility of something being done under article II. Something can be done.

Senator HUMPHREY. And should be.

Senator SPARKMAN. But it has got to be done in accordance with the Constitution of the United States before we are bound by it.

The purpose of this kind of a meeting would be to bring together civilians representing the different countries of NATO, to sit down and say what can we do to better this situation.

I think there has been, I think a great many people have been having nightmares as to what may be proposed. I just do not think it is quite realistic at all.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, I don't see why we can't trust——

Senator SPARKMAN. Certainly no one wants to do anything which would weaken in any way this Government of ours, but what we want to do is get greater security and greater strength.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, you have your NATO Treaty, and you have your Congress of the United States to work with.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes. But some of the witnesses here this morning said, and I am not sure but what you said, that NATO is weak.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Militarily, it has failed, as I understand it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, it only exists militarily now. I think that is what a great many people are beginning to realize, that it has existed as a purely military alliance, and that it simply cannot be sustained in that way. That perhaps was envisioned by those who drafted the treaty originally, when they included article II in it.

And now the purpose of this resolution, I think, could very fairly be interpreted to be to let people come together and discuss the various ways in which that cooperation can be worked out on a civilian basis rather than on a military basis.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Senator GREEN. Mrs. Williams, thank you very much.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator GREEN. There have come to the committee a number of communications, some from witnesses who are unable to appear; others sent in their views and ideas in writing, letters, statements, and telegrams, which I think should be put into the record, but at the conclusion of this hearing.

The next witness is Mr. E. Roy Pursell, Pursell Publishing Co., of Plymouth, Mich.

Is Mr. Pursell not here?

(Mr. Pursell's statement is on p. 237.)

Then in his absence we will proceed to hear Mrs. Enid Griswold, of Montclair, N. J., representing the United States Flag Committee of Jackson Heights, N. Y.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. ENID GRISWOLD, MONTCLAIR, N. J., REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES FLAG COMMITTEE, JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y.**

Mrs. GRISWOLD. Senator Green, I would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee.

I have with me the statement of the chairman, which is somewhat lengthy. I would therefore like to read a few excerpts from that statement, and also make a few extemporaneous remarks.

Senator GREEN. And have the whole statement included in the record, is that the idea?

Mrs. GRISWOLD. Yes. We appear in opposition to this Senate concurrent resolution.

First of all, we take exception to the fact that we are asked to join with other democracies, contending that the United States of America is not in the strict sense a democracy, it is a constitutional republic.

Only last summer I personally visited nearly all of the NATO countries. They may be democracies, yes, but they are all socialistic. In almost every country where I went, I was told, well, they have a labor socialist government.

After all, we Americans all came from people who originated in, or most of us came from people who originated in, those countries. We left behind the old world and, much as we may love the beauty and the

culture of the old world, I feel that we have achieved certain things in this country, because of our unique type of government, which we do not wish to lose, and it is the contention of the Flag Committee that in merging with these other countries we will lose the thing that is most precious to us.

After all, through the generations, the United States of America has been a mecca, it has been the idea of so many people in those countries to come here. I can't tell you how many times last summer young people in the countries where I visited said to me, "Oh, we are coming to America, we want to come to America. There is so little opportunity for us here."

So why should we in any way endanger that form of government which means so much, not only to us, but to other people all over the world?

I believe that in the United States of America, we have achieved the highest form of development of government of our western civilization, and that is something we must cherish and preserve.

Also, one of the points which I think is very important, I would like to bring out. I am quoting from George Washington when he said:

It is important that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with the administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres.

#### OPPOSITION TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

We feel that since every elected officer is under oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States from enemies within and without, we wonder whether it is possible for Members of Congress to approve such a resolution as this, knowing that if these ideas were to succeed, they would supersede, weaken, and perhaps eventually destroy that which these elected representatives of the people are under oath to protect.

I would also like to quote from a letter from Mr. Frank Holman, whom I am sure you all know, who was questioned on this very matter. He wrote:

I believe that any Congressman, legislator, or judge who sponsors any form of world government or, for that matter, the socialistic state, violates his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same.

We concur wholeheartedly in this statement.

We also believe that there is grave danger that this stronger political and economic alliance would mean a loss of at least part of our sovereignty, and I would like to again read from the written statement.

It would mean the loss of sovereignty and the loss of the protection under our own Bill of Rights.

The late Justice Roberts, former president of Atlantic Union Committee, stated in a speech printed in the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 2, 1943:

An international government with police power over every individual citizen in the nations belonging to it, instead of over merely the national governments as such, is the only way to keep peace.

We ask, in such a case, where would our liberty and freedom be, and who would constitute this international government with police power directly over you and me?

Quoting again from the same speech, Mr. Roberts said :

The individual citizen's loyalty and responsibility to the international government would stand over his own loyalty to this own country.

In that case, how long and to what extent would our national sovereignty and our national government remain and endure?

We believe also that if the American people understood this proposition, if it were fairly explained to them and they were given a chance to vote, that they would vote overwhelmingly against it.

We also believe that it is very late in this session of Congress to consider a resolution that is of such far-reaching importance. We realize that you Senators have a great deal of work to complete before adjournment, and we feel that it is unwise to take any definite steps so late in your calendar.

I think that is all, Senators, and I thank you.

Senator GREEN. Have you any questions?

Senator SPARKMAN. No questions, thank you.

Senator GREEN. Thank you very much, and we will put the whole statement in our record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES FLAG COMMITTEE, JACKSON HEIGHTS,  
LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to represent the United States Flag Committee. This committee, as the name indicates, was set up to defend and protect our national emblem by supporting all that it symbolizes. We interpret this to mean—our great American Republic; our Constitution which we believe to be superior to any other in the world; our republican form of government which our Constitution guarantees to us; and the Declaration of Independence—that great spiritually inspired document through which we were given our priceless heritage of liberty, freedom, and independence. We oppose anything by any name which even weakens, much less destroys those most valuable gifts which we have inherited and desire to keep for our posterity.

When George Washington stated "Put only Americans on guard tonight" we believe he had in mind the kind of Americans who are loyal to the above mentioned, and we also believe the members of our Flag Committee to be in that category. When Washington warned against "dangerous alliances" and "European entanglements" we believe he referred to just the sort of alliance being promoted by the Atlantic Union Committee through this Resolution 12, calling for an "exploratory convention." Again quoting Washington, "It is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres." We prefer to abide by the advice of the God-inspired man, who, more than anyone else, was instrumental in giving us our great American Republic. We ask the question. Are the Senators "entrusted with its administration" (our Government) confining themselves to "their respective constitutional spheres" if they now consider any plan which will eventually destroy our form of government?

Theodore Roosevelt stated many times that there is no room in this country "for hyphenated Americans." We agree. There should be no room in this country for hyphenated or dual loyalty any more than out and out disloyalty. We believe this would follow any attempt to seriously discuss the Atlantic Union plan which would definitely cause dual-allegiance to our flag and country by placing an allied banner over the Stars and Stripes. We oppose therefore, any idea of even considering the Atlantic Union Resolution 12, introduced February 2, 1955, by Senator Kefauver. We believe the willingness to listen to such an idea through these hearings weakens, in proportion to the amount of consideration given, the complete loyalty and allegiance to our flag and all that it represents.

We could not list all of the many points of our opposition for lack of time and space. We therefore select a few of the many, given below with proper references, some of which are here attached for your inspection.

1. This resolution calls for a union of democracies. The United States is a constitutional republic. How can we, therefore, join in this so-called union of democracies when we are not a democracy? Why should Senators wish to give away their own republican form of government for some untried, theoretical plan? The Atlantic Union Committee does not define democracy as they use the term. The members of the NATO countries considered for this union of democracies are not all of the same kind. To call these countries democracies is incorrect. To attempt such a political union seems absurd and could easily end in the greatest conflict of ideas the world ever experienced or witnessed.

2. Oath of office: Since every elected official (supposedly servants of the people) are under oath of office to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States from enemies within and without," we ask—how is it possible for Senators to consider this resolution with integrity, knowing full well that if the idea were to succeed, it would supersede, weaken, and eventually destroy that which these elected representatives of the people are under oath to protect? We believe in this case the idea of federal union with the NATO countries would be an "enemy" both "from within and without." Mr. Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, made this written statement: "I believe that any Congressman, legislator, or judge who sponsors world government, or for that matter the socialistic state, violates his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same." Is that the position this Foreign Relations Committee wishes to place themselves? We stand for complete loyalty and therefore oppose any possible violation of the oath of office, which the act of supporting this resolution could include.

3. Within the membership of the Atlantic Union and Federal Union Committees there are many Rhodes scholars of whom Clarence Streit, the originator of Federal Union and promoter of the Atlantic Union Resolution 12, is a most influential one. One of the ideas of Cecil Rhodes in establishing the Rhodes scholarships was to endeavor to bring back the American colonies under the control of Great Britain, and with no war or bloodshed. We believe that there is a strong possibility that this resolution 12 may have this as one of its hidden objectives. From the Christian Science Monitor, April 4, 1941, we quote: "The first formal proposal for a union between Great Britain and America is to come before the British Parliament shortly. Prime Minister Winston Churchill was asked 'whether he will suggest to President Roosevelt that the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations should consider entering into a solemn act of union.'"

From the Sunday Times, London, February 25, 1951, we quote: "Call for Atlantic Union studied in London. The possibility of taking steps to develop the NATO countries into a full political union of states is now being considered in both Houses of Parliament." In a letter from Douglas Robinson, Federal Union, 20 Buckingham Street, London, May 11, 1955, we quote: "I am interested to note it was Clarence Streit's book, *Union Now With Britain*, which you were reading. The aspects with which we are concerned are European unity, closer economic and political unity with Atlantic and British commonwealth nations—and, finally, the ultimate object of world government."

We object to promoting one idea under the guise of something else. Our forefathers fought a victorious war to establish our freedom from this very thing, giving us the Declaration of Independence from the same British Commonwealth. We believe in keeping this independence and also believe that before any further move is made to destroy it every voter in America should be given the true facts—unbiased and without slanted propaganda together with a chance to vote pro or con by the ballot. If so, we firmly believe the majority of Americans would vote to retain our national independence and likewise would not vote to retain any Congressman who favored the destruction of our independent state. This important step to determine the fate of our Nation should not rest with a few who constitute a committee nor be rushed through the last minute of any session of Congress. We want to keep our independence. Will it be necessary to fight to keep it as we did to get it? It could be that if such an exploratory convention were ever called the American spirit of loyalty and patriotism, for long too apathetic, might be aroused again to meet the occasion. It seems doubtful that the majority of Americans would surrender without protest.

4. Fear: The idea of the Atlantic Union, as with most foreign policies today, seems to be based on fear. At least the fear technique is being used to promote the one-world schemes. We are told we must have a Federal Union with the



NATO countries to stop Communist aggression in Europe. We must have this union to save the United Nations. We must be willing to sacrifice our American independence for all time to come to accomplish all this, although the whole argument is only based on prophecy and conjecture. Why give up our Republic through fear in order to stop Russian Communist aggression in Europe when all NATO countries including the United States of America have a large number of Communists and fellow travelers and with no great visible attempt to eliminate them? Also is not the Atlantic Union idea an example of ultra-aggression? If later on Russia is included in this future world federation (which is the plan of the Atlantic Union) then how would that very aggression for which we are asked to make the sacrifice of our country have been stopped? We believe the result would be that the United States of America had "been taken over" instead.

Our Nation was founded and victories won on the basis of faith in God the Creator, not on the basis of fear, which is a negative and destructive policy. We believe in our motto "In God We Trust." Faith and divine guidance should lead us in determining our policies as it did our forefathers in establishing our great Nation. There is a strange absence of any such consideration in all these plans. We know that bombs destroy material structures. We know what happened when used over Japan. We know the thought of them is terrifying. The men and women who made America were no doubt very fearful of the arrow and other elements with which they were confronted. They were, however, still more afraid of slavery. Japan itself was not destroyed because of the atom bombs. A strong nation cannot be destroyed by bombs but it can be destroyed by surrender to world government. Daniel Webster spoke immortal words and truths when he said, "Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under new cultivation, they will grow again \* \* \* even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble \* \* \* all these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with state rights, individual dignity, and public prosperity? No. If these columns fall they will not be raised again." The thought of the final destruction of our constitutional liberty for all time to come, is far more fearful than the possibility of bombs. Have we raised a nation of cowards that we cannot face the national fears with the courage of our fathers?

5. Loss of sovereignty and the loss of protection under our own Bill of Rights. The late Justice Roberts, former president of the Atlantic Union Committee, stated in a speech in 1943 and printed in the Philadelphia Inquirer May 2, 1943, "An international government with police power over every individual citizen in the nations belonging to it, instead of over merely the national governments as such, is the only way to keep peace \* \* \*." The question follows: In such a case where would your liberty and your freedom be then? Who would constitute this international government (or dictatorship) with police power directly over you? Quoting from the same speech again, Roberts said, "The individual citizen's loyalty and responsibility to the international government would stand over his own loyalty to his own country." In that case how long and to what extent would our national sovereignty and National Government—which our flag symbolizes—endure? How much power would be left to Congress in a short time? The Atlantic Union objectives include common citizenship, common currency, common laws enforced by an international court, and unrestricted immigration. We oppose all of these ideas. We desire to keep the destiny of our Republic in our own control. We wish to cooperate on a friendly working basis with all free countries of the world, and do not accept the theory that it is necessary to join a world federation and surrender our independent Nation in order to obtain peace. In fact, we believe we would never obtain real peace if we did.

6. The Atlantic Union plan would function within the framework of the United Nations. That point should be understood. People largely believe that the NATO idea and the U. N. are two separate things. In this union, we are told, the one would complete and strengthen the other. In Freedom and Union magazine, September 1950, pages are devoted to showing point by point the similarity between the U. N. Charter and the Atlantic Union plan. They state "the ultimate aim is the democratic union of all peoples to be formed gradually." In other words it is deceptive, leading people to think it is a harmless alliance



with merely the NATO countries. However, if half the world were united according to the AUC plan to stop the aggression of the other half, all were members of the United Nations, how could anyone think that would establish peace? Would not such a state make for rivalry? Or even war? We oppose such fantastic, untried proposals and prefer to agree with Franklin when he said "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." We look at this proposal as a bold attempt to destroy American independence and overthrow our form of government.

7. "Exploratory Convention," is a misleading term. If such a step were voted upon, what would be the next step, and the next and the next? They say the Federal Union will be formed "gradually" \* \* \* First, the delegates to do this "exploring" would be invited to attend (they do not say where they will meet—maybe England). The delegates to represent all the citizens of the United States of America would be, of course, those in sympathy with the idea—no one else would get appointed—just as with the United Nations. Most of our citizens would know little if anything about it. Quoting from Stop World War III With Atlantic Union, "delegates would draft a new constitution. You, the citizen, would merely transfer to the Atlantic Union government some of the powers you now entrust to your representatives in Washington. The United States Federal Government would lose some of its delegated authority. The powers to be transferred to the union would be determined by the convention." They do not state what powers, just "some," nor how many powers, just "some." Nor the fact they may decide to transfer more and more each year until there are none left to the Federal Government. In other words the delegates from the 15 NATO countries would be in a position to dictate to us what we must give up to them, and they would have the authority over us through the police power. We enclose a map of the world which shows one of the future plans. Please note also, that the 15 NATO countries include the United Kingdom and Canada, which is supposedly a part of the kingdom. The United States of America is one. Is this not comparable to the situation in the U. N. Security Council where both Russia and her satellites are included? And with all this upheaval to stop Russian aggression, someday (perhaps soon) there is to be a world government including Russia. Then what about the aggression we were supposed to stop? Why not begin first, by stopping the aggression of Communists right here at home in our own country as well as in the other NATO countries heavily infiltrated with them before we give up or give away our Republic on this plea? Only recently Churchill suggested that even now Russia be taken into NATO. Why talk of coexistence with the Communists and offer them the inspection of our airbases in one breath, and then consider the sacrificing of our Nation to stop their aggression in the next? Does that make sense to you gentlemen? Look behind the curtains backstage and examine this cleverly planned affair. Face it for what it really is. We oppose the selling out process of America under any name.

8. Clarence Streit stated he had worked for 21 years to bring this Atlantic Union idea about. In reality could this not mean that he had worked 21 years to change or overthrow our Government? What else could it mean? And yet he and his friends are given the utmost consideration and courtesy. What difference is there in principle who does it or under what name, if a plan is promoted for the purpose of eventually taking over our Government? The final result would be the same. There are even those who believe that communism may some day crumble from within \* \* \* if so, then why give up all we cherish for a temporary situation which may not exist in the coming generation? Or are all these reasons only used as a ruse? The fine sounding theories and propaganda of the Atlantic Union Committee should be examined. England has long and constantly desired to recognize Red China. In such a union we would be forced to do so if the majority of the member states voted for it. Our right to make our own decisions would be completely overruled, but no doubt our taxes would be greatly increased. It would be a case of "unconditional surrender" \* \* \*

Our Goal—The Government of All the World, by Elmo Roper, then treasurer now president of the Atlantic Union has distributed a booklet by this name a copy of which is attached. This explains fully the whole scheme. In it Mr. Roper states "many members of all world government organizations came together under the Atlantic Union Committee" as they believe it would be more possible to sell the idea to the people by starting with a few countries than to persuade people to adopt world government all at once. By unity with a part of the world

first "we would be taking a decisive step in breaking down national barriers." "It became clear that the first step toward world government cannot be completed until we have advanced on four fronts; the economic, the military, the political, and the social. The economic came first (union under the Marshall plan); the military has now come (the Atlantic Pact); the political must come next and the social will follow." We implore you, gentlemen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to study this document and other material submitted before making any further decisions. You are the custodians of our constitutional form of government. The American voters elected you to support the Constitution not to consider undermining it.

We, therefore, as Americans loyal to our flag and country, standing for our great Republic and for independence, must oppose any conspiracy or plan to change or destroy our republican form of government. We believe that the Atlantic Union Resolution 12 promotes such a plan. Such a union would destroy one of the most cherished ideals of man, his love of country, his sense of patriotism, or devotion to his Nation. To place a free man under an alien police power would destroy his liberty, his freedom and his happiness all of which are essential for peace. The Atlantic Union idea, if discussed, will tend to give out the false premise that our constitutional form of government is a failure and not adequate to meet the needs of today. Nothing is further from the truth. The failure has been in the lack of proper support and the use of the Constitution as was intended, putting in place of our free enterprise system the New Deal or "New Social Order." We therefore recommend, that rather than listen to these one world arguments, our constitutional Government be given first place and practiced again as it has not been for some time. That patriotism and allegiance to our flag replace the present internationalism taught in our schools. That Americans return to being the kind of Americans that made this country great. The unity needed is a unified spirit of 1776—united under our Stars and Stripes, with no other allegiance than to God the Creator. By so doing, by educating strong, courageous, and loyal citizens we will again win the respect of the world which we formerly enjoyed. Then there will be no need to surrender our independence.

Respectfully submitted.

HELEN P. LASELL, *Chairman.*

Members of the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) are: United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, and West Germany.

Question: With one vote in a union with these countries, to what extent would we be able to control our future destiny?

Sponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 in the Senate, February 9, 1955: Estes Kefauver, Ralph Flanders, Hubert Humphrey, Henry Jackson, Herbert Lehman, Russell Long, Pat McNamara, James E. Murray, Matthew Neely, Richard Neuberger, Joseph O'Mahoney, Frederick Payne, W. Kerr Scott, Mike Mansfield, John Sparkman.

Sponsors of the same resolution in the House of Representatives: Hale Boggs, Sterling Cole, Clifford Davis, Robert Hale, Chet Holifield, John Pilcher, Percy Priest, Frank Smith, Francis Walter, Clement Zablocki, Leroy Johnson, Walter Judd, Lee Metcalf, Abraham Multer, James Murray.

Since this resolution was introduced, 2 more Senators and 65 Members of the House of Representatives have been added to this list of sponsors.

(Additional material furnished by Mrs. Griswold is on file at the committee.)

Senator GREEN. The next witness is Mrs. A. E. Bonbrake, representing the Catholic Action Guild, Forest Hills, N. Y.

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. A. E. BONBRAKE, REPRESENTING THE CATHOLIC ACTION GUILD, FOREST HILLS, N. Y.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. I am Mrs. Bonbrake, of the Catholic Action Guild of Forest Hills, Long Island.

Before I start on my talk, which I have kept within the required limit, I would like to ask a question. I am going to write something

about this resolution, and I want to know whether I am going to call it resolution 12. Has this been reintroduced? It is altogether different. The resolve is quite different. You have left out the words—well, I have them right in front of me.

## THE REVISED RESOLUTION

I have the Resolution 12 which was in the Congressional Record of February 9, and that is the last form of the resolution I have seen. I have never seen another. No one has told me there is a new one.

The one I got this morning has quite a lot of changes in it. In fact, it is so different that it ought to be a new resolution with a new number. It is not fair. You have taken out the words “federally or otherwise” entirely. It is out, it is gone, and the “Federal” is the most important thing in the resolution, as far as I am concerned.

And you also put in that, “within the United Nations and the Atlantic Union, it will be in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States.”

Are you inferring that the NATO nations, the North Atlantic nations, will all work together under the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States? Are you inferring that? Do you think that the North Atlantic nations would ever work all together in one grand body under the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States?

That is what the resolution says. The old one didn't say that.

It is utterly ridiculous, to me, to expect a whole group of nations; and then the “federally, or otherwise,” was very important, and that is left out. Is it a new resolution?

Senator GREEN. To answer your question, this hearing is on a printed copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. I think you have a copy there.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. I have it.

Senator GREEN. Well, if you will try to confine your attention to that.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. All right.

Am I justified, when I write about this, that that resolution still stands? Does that stand?

Senator GREEN. That is the one that is referred to this committee.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. Is the other one going to be reintroduced?

Senator GREEN. We will consider other drafts if we like.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. Well, it would have to be introduced all over again.

Senator GREEN. It would have to be, or changed on the floor.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. You leave out the important words.

Senator GREEN. I am sorry—

Mrs. BONBRAKE. It is very strange to come in to debate something and find a new form.

Senator GREEN. This committee is holding a hearing on this draft, Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, and we are glad to hear your views on that.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. All right. Thank you so much. I wanted to be sure of that, because I don't want to be talking about something else entirely.

I am going to be a little personal, so I beg your indulgence, if you will be kind. I am not going to pull any punches at all.

## OPPOSITION TO ATLANTIC UNION

It is unbelievably fantastic that we who are speaking here today against Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which proposes an Atlantic Union Exploratory Convention, find it necessary to defend the survival of our United States constitutional government before our duly elected representatives who have sworn to defend and protect this Constitution.

I am quite aware that you are thinking this so-called Atlantic Union resolution is only a proposal for an "exploratory" convention, and that it stands for nothing definite.

I charge that this term "exploratory" is a deceptive one, as back of this Atlantic Union resolution there is a very definite plan, which has been kept in the background as far as the public is concerned.

Some of our Congressmen who sponsored this resolution in years past and who have now withdrawn their support, were under the false impression they were merely supporting an Atlantic Defense Pact, as when the Atlantic nations first joined together, their agreement was called the North Atlantic security pact.

To prove that there is a definite plan, I will quote from a book entitled "The Goal Is Government of All the World." This book was written by Elmo Roper, who is now president of the Atlantic Union Committee. Under the subtitle, "How Federal Union Would Work," Mr. Roper says:

Federal Union is a proposed union of the governments whose people believe in the dignity of the individual and in freedom. \* \* \* These governments would merge into a single Atlantic Federal Union. Such a Union would have the right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between States in the Union, and grant Union citizenship. The Union must have the power to tax and to uphold its own bill of rights. The distribution of executive, legislative, and judicial powers, which would be left to the member States of the Union, would all have to be worked out in a constitutional convention of the Union.

There would be no veto in this union. The only absolute veto would be the collective veto that each branch of its congress would have. No law could be passed without the consent of a majority in both the union house and senate. \* \* \* Representation would be apportioned according to population.

To place the responsibility for this resolution which we are discussing, I will further quote Mr. Roper:

Some of us who have been interested in world government for several years now, have come together to form the Atlantic Union Committee. Our objective in this committee is to have the Congress pass a resolution supporting the calling of a constitutional convention of at least the Atlantic Pact sponsors. \* \* \* Such a resolution has already been introduced in the House and Senate.

The convention for which it calls, would explore the possibilities of a political, economic, and military union among the democracies in the Atlantic area. It would undoubtedly take a constitutional amendment for the United States to agree to participate in such a political union. It is true that some of our traditional rules of governmental organization would have to undergo some change.

Such an Atlantic Union would be a member of the United Nations. \* \* \* There would be nothing—there must be nothing—in such a union which would be out of consonance with the aims and objectives of the United Nations.

Ponder this last sentence. Does it mean the union—the Atlantic Federal Union—would, in being a member of the United Nations, supersede or take the place of its formerly sovereign members in the United Nations? What else could it mean? And when considering the United Nations, we must never forget that Soviet Russia is a member and always to be reckoned with.

## THE ROAD TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

The members of this senatorial committee will not really be voting on an "exploratory" resolution; you will be voting on the inauguration of a most definite plan by a definite sponsor, the Atlantic Union Committee.

You will be considering whether the United States shall amend its Constitution to the point of nullity, and join a union which says frankly, "Our goal is government of all the world."

And some of you gentlemen were concerned about what the Bricker amendment would do to our Constitution.

To substantiate this statement, I will quote some testimony given before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate in February 1950, when Senator Estes Kefauver tried to get Mr. John D. Hickerson and Mr. Dean Rusk, of the State Department, to endorse the Atlantic Union resolution for an exploratory convention.

At that time, Mr. Hickerson said:

Heretofore in international organizations we have proceeded on the basis of cooperation between independent sovereign powers. Involved in this resolution is a surrender of sovereignty. It is a question so fundamental that it affects the rights and interests of every man, woman, and child in the United States. \* \* \* The State Department could not support such a resolution.

During this discussion in 1950, Senator Kefauver made the following statement:

You say that this involves not only basic economic and social changes, but also changes in the structure of the United States Government. That is conceded to be true.

I now ask the present Foreign Relations Committee this question: If this Atlantic Union resolution was highly dangerous to our constitutional sovereignty in 1950, why is it less dangerous today? Although there have been a few changes in wording, the intent of the resolution is the same.

Senator Kefauver told us in 1950 it would change the structure of our traditional Government. It will do the same today. Are you willing and is our State Department willing that this shall happen?

## EXECUTIVE BRANCH ATTITUDE TOWARD SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Whether our present State Department would agree with the State Department of 1950, I have grave doubts. John Foster Dulles, our Secretary of State, has been in accord with the Atlantic Union Committee plan for Federal union since 1949, when he was a Senator.

He said then, "As a Senator, I shall vote for the Atlantic Union resolution. I have already indicated to the proposers of the resolution my sympathy with their purpose, and I repeat I intend to confirm this by vote when the resolution is before the Senate for action." Mr. Dulles kept his word.

You may ask, "Did Mr. Dulles change his opinion since he has been Secretary of State?" It is evident he did not. Right after he was appointed Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles sent a wire to the convention of the Atlantic Union Committee in Buffalo, November 22, 1952, expressing "full support" of the Atlantic Union plan, and suggested that it be accomplished "in connection with the development of NATO."

Then, before going to Paris to the NATO convention the first week of May 1956, Mr. Dulles made a most significant speech. Among other things, he said:

The time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning \* \* \*. If that be the common desire of the NATO members nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring these possibilities which now beckon us forward.

By whose authority did Mr. Dulles commit the United States to such a decision?

I made an analysis of this speech by Mr. Dulles, and it was published in The Tablet of May 5, 1956. I believe I was justified in asking, in this published statement, "Has our Congress authorized the United States to 'join eagerly' in the Exploratory Convention in Paris this week?"

I do not believe this was an unwarranted question, as at that time our New York press reported that when Senator Kefauver heard about the statements made by Mr. Dulles regarding the exploratory work to be done at the NATO convention, he said, "Well, it's about time."

There are many world government enthusiasts in our State Department. Some are World Federalists, as is Mr. Harold Stassen, according to his own published statement. Others support the Atlantic Union plan for world government.

Our present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, is listed as a member of the national council and board of governors of the Atlantic Union Committee, as was our former Secretary, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

#### SENATE SPONSORS OF ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

But that should not shock this committee, as your chairman, Senator Walter F. George, who has just been appointed United States representative to NATO by the President, was a sponsor of the original Atlantic Union resolution.

Members of this committee who were also sponsors of the original Atlantic Union exploratory resolution are: Senators William Fulbright, John J. Sparkman, Hubert H. Humphrey, Mike Mansfield, and George D. Aiken.

According to the Congressional Record of February 9, 1955, in support of the Atlantic Union resolution again submitted by Senator Kefauver on that date, there are listed the names of Senators John J. Sparkman, Hubert H. Humphrey, and Mike Mansfield, members of your committee.

With so many members of this Foreign Relations Committee already committed to the Atlantic Union Committee resolution, I find myself wondering if your sympathies for this plan may consciously, or unconsciously, affect your judgment on this resolution and your consequent vote?

I hope you will be able to keep an open mind, but it is quite logical for us to think it will be difficult.

#### OBJECTIVES OF PROPONENTS

When speaking of the Atlantic Union plan, I would not want to neglect the man who first introduced into our country the idea of

"Union Now"—Clarence K. Streit—who is president of Federal Union, Inc., which was formed in 1938, and I believe editor of the magazine, Freedom and Union.

Before Mr. Streit's ideas were propagandized, we in the United States had always taken it for granted that we had a real "Union" with a traditional constitutional government. Those were the good days, before the poisonous doctrine of world government had infiltrated our United States.

I have the copy of a letter written by Mr. Streit in May 1955, in which he said, "The resolution is by no means out of the woods. But in the 21 years I have worked for this convention, I recall no time when the outlook was half so favorable."

In this same letter, Mr. Streit says that Senator George twice co-sponsored the Atlantic Union resolution, and that the Senator had informed him that his Foreign Relations Committee would soon consider the Atlantic Union resolution.

Mr. Streit also said that Mr. Dulles had endorsed the resolution even before he became Secretary of State, which of course we well know, and that he wrote the introduction to the book the *New Federalist*.

Clarence Streit, who says he has worked 21 years for this Atlantic Union exploratory convention, has made some quite significant statements to the newspapers in New York City. He had a letter published in the New York Times of April 16, 1952, not long before our last presidential election, in which he said:

Now I have something encouraging to give \* \* \* to mention but one example of that progress—one that speaks volumes: Two of the leading presidential aspirants, Senator Kefauver and General Eisenhower, are both now identified with the concept of Atlantic Union.

In the Times again, March 12, 1955, Mr. Streit had a letter headed "Atlantic Union defined." He rambled on about the analogy between the Federal Union of the original 13 Colonies and a federal union for the world.

In essence he said, "We did it with the Thirteen Colonies: why can't we do it with the world?" A translation of the meaning of that statement would be that after we had fought and won the battle for a free Federal Union, which is now the United States, we throw away the benefits of that freedom and that union and put ourselves in the position of being governed by other countries.

#### ATTRIBUTES OF SOVEREIGNTY

In the spring of 1951, the Atlantic Union committee had a meeting in our New York City Town Hall, a meeting which I personally attended, and a detailed report of which I sent to the Tablet. It was published July 14, 1951.

The main speakers at this meeting were Senator Kefauver and Elmo Roper, and there was a recorded talk by Lester Pearson of Canada, one of the new NATO cabinet members, facetiously called by our newspapers, "the three wise men."

In his talk that night, these were the expressions Senator Kefauver applied to our national sovereignty:

"Just multiply the 48 States"—"extend our sovereignty"—"share our sovereignty"—"exercise our sovereignty"—"pool our sover-



eighty." The Senator ignored completely the fact that these expressions are in exact contradiction with the nature and definition of the term "sovereignty" itself.

During the question period, I asked Senator Kefauver about his definition of "sovereignty." I also asked him about the stabilization of the Union's "common currency." I asked him whose gold would back it, and would it by chance be our Fort Knox gold?

Senator Kefauver answered me as follows, and I quote:

The people of the United States are not interested in legalistic terms; they are not going to be impressed by high-sounding terms. Sovereignty, after all, is in the people; if the people want to share that sovereignty, for the good of all, it is their decision.

A United States Senator should know that once what is called sovereignty is "shared," it is no longer sovereignty.

#### SOVIET ATTITUDE TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT

It is often said by world-government proponents that Soviet Russia is opposed to world government. That is not a fact. Russia hopes eventually to have the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

My question for you is: Are we helping Soviet Russia attain her goal without any actual participation from her?

Senator GREEN. Excuse me.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. I have got one paragraph more. Could I just finish it?

Senator GREEN. I was going to remind you, you already had 20 minutes.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. I am on my last page.

Senator GREEN. Very well, finish.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. This is taken from the program of the Communist International of 1936:

That dictatorship can be established only by a victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the proletariat republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system of federal unions would expand \* \* \* at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

It seems to me we are trying to furnish Soviet Russia, readymade, her system of federal unions. We should think about this before George Orwell's World of 1984 materializes—a group of federal unions united under one big brother, the Soviet Union.

An Atlantic defense pact is one thing; an Atlantic federal union is quite another. If this resolution ever gets to the floor of our Senate for debate, the American people are going to insist that it be discussed openly and honestly as a specific plan for world government and recognized as such.

In closing, I will say again that there is a sense of unreality in appearing before a United States Senate committee, pleading that we retain the constitutional government founded and fought for by our forefathers and defended by many loyal Americans since then.

Senator GREEN. Senator, have you any questions?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have many, but I am afraid we cannot take the time today.

I would only make this comment: that I was appreciative of the information about Mr. Stassen being for world government.



Mrs. BONBRAKE. That was in the New York Times the year of the election, 1952.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Dulles' statement in 1949.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. I must be most candid with you, he has not been quite so explicit in his most recent statements.

Mrs. BONBRAKE. I might make a comment that I don't think the Atlantic Union Committee is going to like your new resolution very well.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

Senator GREEN. Thank you, Mrs. Bonbrake.

(Additional material furnished by Mrs. Bonbrake is on file with the committee.)

The next witness is Mr. William P. Shea, of Ronkonkoma, N. Y.

#### STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. SHEA, ATTORNEY, RONKONKOMA, N. Y.

Mr. SHEA. Senators, I hope you don't mind if I stand. Would it be all right, instead of sitting down?

Senator GREEN. Certainly.

Mr. SHEA. I feel much more natural on my feet.

I want to thank you very, very much—

Senator GREEN. I think my experience in such gatherings as this is that without notes it is apt to be a long discourse. I hope you will be an exception to that rule.

Mr. SHEA. Senator, let me say this: I thank you for allowing me to come before your committee, and I will not test your patience in any way.

Senator GREEN. Thank you.

Mr. SHEA. I have not prepared any statement, and I don't intend to submit any statement. I am not down here at the request of anyone. I simply did know that the hearing was going to take place, and I felt that as an American citizen, not as an attorney, not as anybody else, but simply as an American citizen, I should come down here to talk to you about it.

I have a stake in the United States of America that stems from three subjects: First, I was born here; second, I fought for my country; and third, I have 5 children, and I will have 6, who were born in this country.

I think that entitles any man to say what he has to say with regard to the subject under discussion now.

#### CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSAL

I can only say this with respect to this resolution: That we are deceiving ourselves, completely deceiving ourselves, if we think that we can do this thing within constitutional bounds. It is an impossibility. It cannot be done that way.

Once you set up any type of organization, you may say that it is done and must work within the framework of our Constitution; but you Senators know, more than anyone else, that there is a difference, a complete difference, between "right" and "power."

This organization that you are thinking of, which may possibly be set up, may never have the right to do something, but it may have the power to do it; and when it does it, how are we going to check it with

our Constitution? It is an impossibility. It is fait accompli. The thing is done.

Now, if it is done and if it does affect the lives of the citizens of the United States in a way which is not concurrent with our United States Constitution, then I think that we have lost. I think we have lost.

It may only be this little bit of sovereignty that has been talked about this morning, but once you do lose that bit of sovereignty, you have lost sovereignty. Once you lose independence, you are dependent. The terms are absolutely opposites. There is no question in my mind about it.

My grandfather, my father, myself, my children, have all lived and will all die in this country. We love our country. We don't want to see any actions taken which in any way would preclude us from exercising those liberties which we have always exercised and which my grandfather came over to this country in order to be able to obtain.

Senator GREEN. Excuse my interrupting you, but would you rather I wouldn't?

I was wondering whether you were intimating that those who were on the other side, who had the opposite view, did not love their country?

Mr. SHEA. I would be very far off the course if I said that they did not love their country, believe me.

Senator, when I say that, I am sincere. I believe that there is a right and wrong to this proposition. I believe that they have got every bit as much of a voice as I have, because they think they are right. It so happens I think they are wrong. But let's don't take the inference I don't think they love their country.

Senator GREEN. That is the reason I interrupted you. I was doubtful what you thought about the others, on the other side of the question.

#### EXPERIENCES WITH THE NATO AND THE U. N.

Mr. SHEA. As a practical matter, let us look without regard to the Constitution or anything else. We say we are already in NATO, militarily speaking. We say we want to look into the possibilities of any kind of economic and political common doctrines.

I say to you this: that we have had our experience with the United Nations. The countries of NATO in a large sense are members of the United Nations. We may have been able to form some type of military organization within the framework of NATO. That organization has yet to be tested.

However, the United Nations has been tested. It has been well tested on the battlefields of Korea, where I did not have the honor to serve, incidentally; and on that battlefield, who bore the brunt of the war? The United States.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think South Korea did.

Mr. SHEA. But they are not in NATO, nor are they a member of the United Nations.

Senator HUMPHREY. But I think the record ought to be clear. I mean, we, as an ally, bore the second largest burden, but the peoples of South Korea bore the major burden.

Mr. SHEA. Senator, I was only speaking of the members of the United Nations.

Now, No. 2, we bore that burden, there is no question, and I will say with all deference to the Senator that is correct, that the Korean people did bear the burden of the war. But while we were doing that, what were our allies doing, the same allies that are within the NATO? They put a very, very few people on the battlefield, but at the same time they managed to trade with the boys who were shooting at their boys.

Now, I take this as a test of their sincerity. I take it as a test of their good faith. I take it as a test of everything that might possibly go into this NATO resolution.

So I ask you, Senators, to consider the past record. Militarily, they have yet to be tested. The same countries were tested in the United Nations.

If we look forward to them politically, economically, I don't see that we have anything to gain. We have the most lovely political system in the world; we have the most lovely economic system in the world here. Certainly their aims and traditions are different from ours.

Why should we allow ourselves to be impurified by any kind of contact with what has been going on there for the past, well, you could say hundred years, 150 years?

So I ask you, Senators, to take those things into serious consideration.

I certainly don't want to take up any more of your time. As I say, I am down here simply for myself. I represent no organization whatsoever. But I do wish you would listen to the plea of an American citizen.

Thank you very much.

Senator GREEN. Any questions?

Senator HUMPHREY. I merely want to thank this man for coming down. I wish more people would take on the burden and responsibilities of citizens on their own.

You came here on your own; you do not represent an organization. You came here as a citizen. This is not to detract from others who have come, don't misunderstand me. I think it is wonderful, regardless of whether we agree on all points of view. Thank God these people are willing to speak up.

Thank you for coming.

Senator GREEN. Thank you for coming.

Mr. SHEA. Thank you, Senator.

Senator GREEN. The next witness is Mr. Clarence K. Streit, board of governors of the Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.

Will you state where you come from, and your address? •

#### STATEMENT OF CLARENCE K. STREIT, MISSOULA, MONT., BOARD OF GOVERNORS, ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, INC.

Mr. STREIT. Mr. Chairman, I am from Washington—well, I am from Missoula, Mont. My name is Clarence K. Streit.

Senator, Mr. Chairman, I would like, in the interests of brevity, to read only a few excerpts from this prepared statement, but to have the whole thing included in the record.

Senator GREEN. You may do that.

Mr. STRETT. I am testifying today because, since the hearings in July a year ago on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, there have been two major developments with regard to it.

On the one hand, the administration has recently taken important steps toward the exploration of greater unity in the Atlantic Community which we supporters of this Atlantic Exploratory Convention resolution have long urged.

On the other hand, its supporters have amended it considerably to remove various objections that have been raised, notably those of Secretary of State Dulles.

The result, I submit, is to narrow the issue down to this: Shall the problem of how best to achieve effective Atlantic unity be explored through only one channel or two? Shall the exploration be only on the diplomatic level, or also on the level that is rockbottom in our Republic, the level of the people themselves?

Put in another form: Shall the convention method of exploring this problem be added to the one patterned on Old World diplomacy, or shall the method that is neglected be the one that is patterned on the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, which produced the greatest success in this field that any joint effort by sovereign States ever had—our own Federal Constitution?

#### DEVELOPMENTS DURING PREVIOUS YEAR

This is the issue, and I wish to testify in favor of Congress supplementing the method of diplomacy by authorizing the proposed convention before it adjourns. I would now briefly summarize the important steps taken since the hearings last summer: First, by the administration in the direction we have long urged; and second, by supporters of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to meet objections to it.

We have stressed for years:

- (a) The dangers resulting from disunion within the Atlantic Community;
- (b) The urgent need of exploring better means of uniting it; and
- (c) the advantages of exploring this problem by the 1787 Convention method.

The administration agreed to the first two of these points in the speech Secretary Dulles made April 23, as one of the opposition witnesses has already brought out.

A little later, the NATO Council named a committee of three foreign ministers to explore Atlantic unification. On May 9, President Eisenhower appointed the eminent chairman of your committee, Senator George, to act as his "personal representative and special Ambassador in the development of this new evolutionary step within the North Atlantic Community," and described its character and importance in these words:

As you know, at the latest meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Council, it was decided to explore—

the very word used in Senate Concurrent Resolution 12—

ways and means by which the North Atlantic Community through the NATO Council or otherwise—

and I would underline those two words, "or otherwise"—

might more fully realize its potential for peace and human welfare. I regard the contribution which the United States can make to this project as of the utmost importance \* \* \*.

We wish all success to this exploration.

Secretary Dulles' chief objection to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 was that it requested the President to call the Convention; whereas Secretary Dulles held that the responsibility for calling it lay entirely with Congress.

Since this had been made known to me before the hearing last year, I was able to testify then, on July 25—see page 36 of the report of that hearing—that—

I feel confident that the great majority of my associates in the Atlantic Union Committee would have no objection to the resolution being altered in the above sense, if this would facilitate its adoption.

#### REVISED RESOLUTION DISCUSSED

Recently, as you know, as Senator Humphrey pointed out, there was circulated to your committee an amended draft of the resolution which was worked out after consultation with various interested parties. It provides for Congress instead of the President to call the Convention.

It also adds five sections to provide for the details which this change requires Congress to spell out. These include provision—made in accordance with an informal suggestion by Secretary Dulles—that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall each appoint half the American delegates, and that "not more than one-half" of these shall be members of any one political party.

We of the Atlantic Union Committee warmly welcome these changes. We also welcome as very important other amendments which implement the last clause in the preamble and assure that the convention shall be a convention of private citizens rather than a diplomatic conference. Thus the amended text stipulates that the delegates "shall not be subject to governmental instructions but shall act in accordance with their individual convictions."

This provision is patterned on the procedure at the 1787 Convention, where it contributed decisively to that meeting's success.

The revised text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 implements this essential provision further by requiring that "at least two-thirds" of the American delegates shall come from private life. It also assures that the United States will have the largest number of votes of any country, since the number of delegates from each nation shall be in "broad proportion to its population."

#### CHANGES FROM THE ORIGINAL

Now, to return to the basic change which the amended resolution makes, in shifting the initiative for the convention from the executive to the Congress. It does this by altering section 1 of the enacting part to read:

1. That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they

name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite—

and so forth.

The amended text, it will be noted, limits the role of the Executive merely to acting as a transmitting agency for Congress.

On May 10, a few days after the NATO Council appointed its three explorers, I discussed this amended draft of the resolution with Secretary Dulles, and found that he wished the President to be omitted entirely from the resolution.

I also gathered, though with less certainty, that it might help in some quarters if the resolution were further amended so that more than the seven original sponsors of NATO would be invited to the convention at the outset.

After consulting some supporters of the resolution, I wrote the Secretary suggesting that all this might be accomplished, if desired, by amending the opening lines of section 1 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to read:

1. That the legislatures of the other democracies which sponsored and negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty, and those included in the subsequent Western European Union, shall be invited to name delegates to meet in a convention—  
and so forth.

The effect of this change would be to omit the President entirely from the resolution, and to extend the invitation to two groups in addition to the sponsors of the treaty, namely, all its negotiators and all the members of the Western European Union.

The latter extension would add the German Federal Republic and Italy; the former would add Norway—and would have the advantage of bringing in a representative of the Scandinavian democracies, and maintaining the balance between the large and small countries.

Personally, I believe it would be wiser to start with only these seven sponsors and Norway. I give my reasons in this article which I would like included in the Appendix, but I would willingly accept the judgment of your committee on this delicate point.

#### ATTITUDE OF STATE DEPARTMENT TOWARD REVISED DRAFT

These suggested amendments brought me this reply from Secretary Dulles, dated June 22:

DEAR CLARENCE: Thank you for your letters of June 8 and June 18, 1956, concerning the current status of the resolution on the Atlantic Exploratory Convention. I appreciate the changes which you are recommending in light of our recent discussion.

As you know, the administration maintains deep interest in steps designed to increase the unity of the Atlantic community. We are presently engaged in exploration, together with the other signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty, of ways and means of developing greater unity within the community. For this purpose, a Ministerial Committee of Three was established by the NATO Foreign Ministers at their last meeting.

As I indicated to you earlier, I cannot judge whether or not the Congress will wish to take on its own responsibility an initiative on the resolution calling for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention. I believe, however, that the executive branch of the Government should not be involved in consideration of this resolution at this time.

Sincerely,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Two points seem to me to stand out in the above letter.

First, the Secretary puts the responsibility for calling the convention entirely on Congress.

Second, he expresses no objection whatever to its supplementing the explorations of NATO's Committee of Three by adopting the amended resolution.

In short, he gives Congress both a green light, and the responsibility for going ahead. As I read his letter, he says that the executive is exploring the problem through diplomatic channels in its jurisdiction, but is punctiliously refraining from advising the Congress on what it should do about exploring the problem through channels that are in its purview.

#### OPPOSITION'S ARGUMENT

I shall not take your time at this late hour to answer the arguments of the opposition witnesses, unless you so desire by the questions you ask me. It seems to me they dodge the real issue.

I have already answered their charges that the proposed convention involves surrender of United States sovereignty. See pages 29-36 of the report of the 1955 hearings. Their other charges are equally or even more ridiculously irrelevant—as, for example, the idea that this semiofficial convention of a few democracies called to explore how to unite the Atlantic Community more strongly is a scheme for world government.

The opponents of this resolution are not concerned with the issue before us but, at best, only with issues that cannot possibly arise until and unless the convention recommends a plan for an Atlantic Federal Union.

In this connection, I would point out that the authors of the amended resolution have amended the original text so that it now reads:

\* \* \* to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs, their joint defense, and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

The Atlantic Union Committee's willingness to accept this amendment is evidence of its desire to reassure everyone that the work of the convention is not limited to exploring the possibility of federation, and that the fears that have been expressed regarding it are groundless.

We all warmly welcome, of course, the provision in that the convention's recommendations shall be "in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States." We are more than willing that those who fear this convention should have this reassurance; our purpose has always been to have the possibilities for peace and freedom that the principles of the United States Constitution contain explored on the Atlantic scale by the convention approach that first discovered them.

#### WHY ACTION NOW?

There remains the question: Why act now, with so little time before Congress adjourns? When we testified last July, we gave several reasons for doing so. The year's developments have made these reasons only more urgent. May I remind you of them, in no "I-told-

you-so" spirit, but simply to measure the growing need for action?

A year ago, we pointed to the uncertainty as regards foreign air-bases under mere alliance. Consider what has happened since then in Iceland.

A year ago we said here that the Kremlin's present aim is to remove "the incentive its tough policy gave the West to unite, rearm, and remain on the alert." Since then, at the Communist Party congress last February, "11 out of 12 main speakers," as General Gruenther stressed when he testified at your mutual security hearing May 31, "cited as the No. 1 objective of Soviet foreign policy the dismemberment of NATO."

Consider all the Kremlin has done since then, its tricky reduction in armed forces, its Mideast moves, its downgrading of Stalin. No wonder General Gruenther warned you:

I think the next 5 years are going to be even more difficult, because the Soviets are getting much more clever in their cold-war tactics.

A year ago we said here that "the mere fact that the United States had called a convention to explore, among other possibilities, the soul-stirring possibility of forming a Federal United States of the Free World would suffice to put the American Revolution again on the march."

Consider the answer General Gruenther gave on May 31 when your distinguished chairman, Senator George, asked him what would be the effect—

if \* \* \* there should arise a belief in the NATO members of Western Europe that there would be a probability that the United States and Canada would become parties in a federated union.

General Gruenther, who is in position to know and who weighs his words, answered at once:

I would say that if the United States were willing to make that kind of offer it would definitely have a favorable influence on the NATO members.

A year ago we said here that one "reason why the Kremlin is now all milk and honey is that it knows how vulnerable it is to the revolutionary forces that the mere calling of this convention just now would set in motion." Consider what has happened since then in Poland.

A year ago we expressed here that the Kremlin aims to win by fostering a depression rather than launching a world war. Today I would add that I fear it is plotting now to bring widespread unemployment in the West by having Europe's Mideast oil supply cut from it.

Secretary Dulles may be right in believing that the Kremlin is really losing control over foreign Communist parties. But if this is true, this picture of weakening communism can hasten relaxation and disunity in the West, thus exposing the Atlantic community all the more to a depression. Communism would gain far more from depression than it risks losing by the present apparent weakening in its control over foreign Communist parties.

If this weakening really grows serious, it may well stimulate the Kremlin to divert attention and restore its authority, not necessarily by the classical method of a foreign war, but rather by confronting us suddenly with the dilemma of either appearing before the world as willing to risk H-bomb world war for oil imperialism—as many



uncommitted nations would see it—or risking an economic crash through loss of Mideast oil.

Certainly we can count on the Kremlin to take all the advantage it can of the uncertainty in Atlantic leadership that will result during the rest of this year from the President's second illness and the election campaign.

If Congress approves the Atlantic Convention before plunging into that campaign, the world will regard it as a move from strength; it will cause consternation in the Kremlin and arouse explosive new hope behind the Iron Curtain; it can turn communism's present weakness into a rout.

But if Congress defers until next year the decision to call this convention, we risk losing these advantages. Since surely you would call this convention after catastrophe fell, why not call it now, in time to prevent it and turn the tide toward peace and freedom? Why leave the grave problem of Atlantic unity to be explored only by NATO's "three wise men"—a committee which one of its members, Foreign Secretary Pearson, of Canada, modestly calls the "three blind mice"?

#### SUPPORT FOR RESOLUTION

This brings me back, in conclusion, to the issue with which I began. Here is a problem to which, as President Eisenhower truly says, the American contribution is "of the utmost importance."

Can that contribution possibly be made to the fullest extent if Congress leaves it entirely to the Executive and excludes from the explorers the people who are alone in position to explore it most fully?

We live at the dawn of the air-atomic age. We are racing toward its high noon, and must explore somehow the political problems it brings.

With the greatest respect for the executive branch of the Government, I ask you: Did we get the airplane by having the Executive instruct the Wright brothers on how to solve the problem? Did we find the secret of harnessing atomic energy by having the Executive instruct the scientists on how to explore it, and what to do from day to day—as it does its diplomatic appointees?

With all respect, I ask a second question: The problem of uniting the democracies effectively has been explored through diplomatic and ministerial channels for many years. Much good has resulted—but what has been done through these channels that can be compared to the enduring success achieved by the convention method when last we tried it between democracies—far back in 1787 at Philadelphia?

It is the private citizens who pay in taxes, liberty, and life; and it is they who have produced the great inventions, in the fields of political science as well as physical science.

Are they to be excluded from exploring this problem of the "utmost importance"? Or will Congress have it explored by the key unit in the American system, whether political or economic—the individual citizen—and by the convention method that produced our greatest success—the Federal Constitution?

This, and this alone, I submit, is the issue now.

One final word: It may be said that there is not time enough left for Congress to act on it before adjournment. Surely that depends

on leadership, and surely there is time for your committee to give Congress an opportunity to act by reporting this resolution favorably as soon as possible.

This we trust you will do.

Senator GREEN. Mr. Streit, thank you for your thoughtful paper. Any questions?

#### EUROPEAN ATTITUDES TOWARD ATLANTIC UNION

Senator HUMPHREY. I only want to ask Mr. Streit this, and it is regrettable we are so short of time on this.

What reactions have you had, if any, Mr. Streit, from other parts of the world, particularly from Europe, on this proposed resolution?

Mr. STREIT. Senator, since the last hearing—we put in some evidence at that time—there have been a number of important evidences of support for it. There was the formation last fall or early this year of a German-Atlantic Society which is supporting the resolution, and it includes a number of very prominent people there. It was formed after one of the members of the board of governors of the Atlantic Union Committee, Mrs. Chase Osborne, the widow of the former Governor of Michigan, went over there and saw a number of people, and she informs me there is very, very wide interest in the Atlantic proposal here.

I have just received a letter from the head of the movement of Atlantic Union in France. The new head is General Billotte, the former Minister of Defense in the late Cabinet of Mr. Faure, and he tells me in the parliamentary group affiliated with this, he now has the adherence of 303 members, divided between 5 parties; and he seeks, and thinks he is going to get, more.

He also says that 10 former Premiers of France, representing an even wider variety of parties, have accepted membership in the Committee for Atlantic Union. I have it in a statement.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would you put it in the record?

Mr. STREIT. I would be glad to.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Since the hearing last year, Gen. Pierre Billotte, Minister for Defense in the recent Faure Cabinet, has been elected President of the French Mouvement pour l'Union Atlantique, which favors the calling of the proposed Atlantic Exploratory Convention. He has launched a vigorous campaign to broaden its support, and in a letter to me dated June 29, 1956, reports this impressive progress:

The following number of deputies in the National Assembly have already adhered to the mouvement's parliamentary group:

Deputies of the Left and Center Republican Parties.....	14
Deputies of the Democratic Union Party.....	18
Deputies of the Popular Republican (Catholic) Party.....	74
Deputies of the Independent and Peasant Party.....	97
Deputies of the Socialist Party.....	100
Total.....	303

The following 10 former Premiers of France—representing an even wider variety of parties—have accepted membership in the honorary committee of the Mouvement for Atlantic Union: Edgar Faure, Felix Gouin, Edouard Herriot, Rene Mayer (now President of the European Coal and Steel Community), Antoine Pinay, Rene Pleven (father of the EDC proposal), Paul Reynaud, Albert Sarraut (chairman of the French Union Assembly), Robert Schuman (father of the Schuman plan).

In addition the honorary committee includes André Le Troquer, Speaker of the National Assembly; Gaston Monnerville, President of the Senate (Conseil de la République); Emile Roche, President of the Economic Council of France.

The fact that in a country divided into so many parties as is France, there is such outstanding and widespread support—apart from the Communists—for the Mouvement for Atlantic Union speaks for itself, but speaks volumes.

Mr. STREIT. I would simply say a country that is divided into so many parties as France, there is so much outstanding and widespread support, apart from the Communists, who are not at all behind this—

Senator HUMPHREY. That leads me to this question: Do you know of any Communist organization, Communist front, or Communist Party, that supports this resolution?

Mr. STREIT. None whatever. They would be all the more—they are and would be much more opposed to this than even to NATO, and you know how strongly they oppose it.

Senator HUMPHREY. And it is a matter of record, of course, that the prime objective of Soviet foreign policy is the dismemberment of NATO.

Mr. STREIT. That is true.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I may want to ask you some other questions, Mr. Streit, but at another time.

If you have anything further in reference to why you wanted to limit this resolution to just the original member countries of NATO, I wish you would submit it in writing so we do not have to take the time on it. Do you have anything on that?

Mr. STREIT. Yes; I do, and I mentioned it in the course of my remarks.

Senator HUMPHREY. Will you submit something to the committee?

Mr. STREIT. Yes, if that could be put in the appendix.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, along with your testimony.

(Mr. Streit's prepared statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF AMENDED ATLANTIC CONVENTION RESOLUTION BY CLARENCE K. STREIT, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

I am testifying today because, since the hearings in July a year ago on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, there have been two major developments with regard to it. On the one hand, the administration has recently taken important steps toward the exploration of greater unity in the Atlantic Community which we supporters of this Atlantic Exploratory Convention resolution have long urged. On the other hand, its supporters have amended it considerably to remove various objections that have been raised, notably those of Secretary of State Dulles.

The result, I submit, is to narrow the issue down to this: Shall the problem of how best to achieve effective Atlantic unity be explored through only one channel or two? Shall the exploration be only on the diplomatic level, or also on the level that is rockbottom in our Republic, the level of the people themselves? Put in another form: Shall the convention method of exploring this problem be added to the one patterned on old world diplomacy, or shall the method that is neglected be the one that is patterned on the Philadelphia convention of 1787, which produced the greatest success in this field that any joint effort by sovereign states ever had, our own Federal Constitution?

That is the issue, and I wish to testify in favor of Congress supplementing the method of diplomacy by authorizing the proposed convention before it adjourns. I would now briefly summarize the important steps taken since the hearing last summer, first, by the administration in the direction we have long urged and second, by supporters of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to meet objections to it.

## ADMINISTRATION NOW FAVORS EXPLOATION

We have stressed for years—

- (a) the dangers resulting from disunion within the Atlantic Community;
- (b) the urgent need of exploring better means of uniting it; and
- (c) the advantages of exploring this problem by the 1787 Convention method.

The administration agreed to the first two of these points in the speech Secretary Dulles made April 23. He said:

"The historic weakness of the West has been its disunity. Out of this disunity came wars which have taken the lifeblood of its finest youth and weakened its economies. A major task of postwar statesmanship was to find the ways whereby the West can maintain its solidarity. \* \* \*

"The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable vital instrument of the Atlantic Community. But the time has come, I believe, to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed, if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations. If that be the common desire of the NATO members, the United States will join eagerly in exploring those possibilities which now beckon us forward."

A little later the NATO Council named a committee of three foreign ministers to explore Atlantic unification. On May 9 President Eisenhower appointed the eminent chairman of your committee, Senator George, to act as his "personal representative and special ambassador in the development of this new evolutionary step within the North Atlantic Community," and described its character and importance in these words:

"As you know, at the latest meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Council, it was decided to 'explore' [the very word used in S. Con. Res. 12] ways and means by which the North Atlantic Community through the NATO Council or otherwise [and I would underline those two words, 'or otherwise'] might more fully realize its potential for peace and human welfare. I regard the contribution which the United States can make to this project as of the utmost importance. \* \* \*

We wish all success to this exploration.

## AMENDED VERSION OF CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Now for my second point, the efforts made by supporters of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to meet objections. When doubt rose regarding the position taken toward Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 by Secretary Dulles in his letter that was read at the hearings on July 29, 1955, Senator Kefauver on August 5 wrote asking him to clarify this. In replying on August 22, the Secretary made clear that he was not opposed to the proposed exploratory convention but merely to certain provisions in the resolution's text. He explained:

"My letter was necessarily directed to the actual text of the pending resolution, and not to any hypothetical alternative, and was addressed primarily to problems which the resolution might create for the executive branch and in relation to the conduct of foreign affairs. For the reasons I gave, I expressed opposition to the passage of the resolution in its actual form. However, *I did not intend thereby to express opposition to any exploration [my emphasis] pursuant to congressional initiative, of the possibilities of increased unity between some or all of the members of the Atlantic Community.*"

The Secretary's chief objection to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 was that it requested the President to call the convention, whereas Secretary Dulles held that the responsibility for calling it lay entirely with Congress. Since this had been made known to me before the hearing last year, I was able to testify then, on July 25 (see p. 36 of the report of that hearing) that "I feel confident that the great majority of my associates in the Atlantic Union Committee would have no objection to the resolution being altered in the above case, if this would facilitate its adoption."

Recently, as you know, Senator Humphrey circulated to your committee an amended draft of the resolution which was worked out after consultation with various interested parties. It provides for Congress instead of the President to call the convention. It also adds five sections to provide for the details which this change requires Congress to spell out. These include provision (made in accordance with an informal suggestion by Secretary Dulles) that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall each appoint half the American delegates, and that "not more than one-half" of these shall be members of any one political party.

This latter replaces the original text's provision that each country's delegation should include members of its "principal political parties," a clause to which Secretary Dulles objected as inappropriate and liable to cause some countries to include Communist delegates. Of course, the supporters of the resolution have never desired to have these latter at this convention.

#### PATTERNED ON PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION

We of the Atlantic Union Committee warmly welcome these changes. We also welcome as very important other amendments which implement the last clause in the preamble and assure that the convention shall be a convention of private citizens rather than a diplomatic conference. Thus the amended text stipulates that the delegates "shall not be subject to governmental instructions but shall act in accordance with their individual convictions." This provision is patterned on the procedure at the 1787 Convention where it contributed decisively to that meeting's success. Any one who studies Madison's Journal of that Convention would agree, I believe, that it could never have drafted the Constitution had the State delegations there been subject—as in any diplomatic meeting—to the instructions of their government and voted each as a bloc.

The revised text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 implements this essential provision further by requiring that "at least two-thirds" of the American delegates shall come from private life. It also assures that the United States will have the largest number of votes of any country, since the number of delegates from each nation shall be in "broad proportion to its population." All these provisions together assure, to the highest degree possible, these four important things:

- (1) That the delegates will include, as in 1787, the best talent available for the task and will represent a wide range of interests;
- (2) That these authorities will enjoy the same freedom in exploring how to unite the Atlantic community effectively that the scientists had when they began probing into the problem of harnessing atomic energy;
- (3) That these delegates, who will grow still wiser by their daily discussions in the convention will be free to ascertain by majority vote what recommendations come nearest to representing their composite wisdom; and
- (4) That though the recommendations of such a convention will merit careful consideration everywhere, no country will be committed to them in the slightest degree, since no delegate can commit any one but himself.

#### RESPONSIBILITY SHIFTED FROM EXECUTIVE TO CONGRESS

Now, to return to the basic change which the amended resolution makes, in shifting the initiative for the Convention from the Executive to the Congress. It does this by altering section 1 of the enacting part to read:

"1. That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they name delegates to meet in a Convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the Convention may invite \* \* \*," etc.

The amended text, it will be noted, limits the role of the Executive merely to acting as a transmitting agency for Congress. On May 10—a few days after the NATO Council appointed its three explorers—I discussed this amended draft of the resolution with Secretary Dulles and found that he wished the President to be omitted entirely from the resolution. I also gathered, though with less certainty, that it might help in some quarters if the resolution were further amended so that more than the seven original sponsors of NATO would be invited to the Convention at the outset. After consulting some supporters of the resolution, I wrote the Secretary suggesting that all this might be accomplished, if desired, by amending the opening lines of section 1 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to read:

"1. That the legislatures of the other democracies which sponsored and negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty, and those included in the subsequent Western European Union, shall be invited to name delegates to meet in a Convention \* \* \*," etc.

The effect of this change would be to omit the President entirely from the resolution, and to extend the invitation to two groups in addition to the sponsors of the treaty, namely, all its negotiators and all the members of the Western European Union. The latter extension would add the German Federal Republic

and Italy; the former would add Norway, and would have the advantage of bringing in a representative of the Scandinavian democracies, and maintaining the balance between the large and small countries. The Convention would thus begin with a representative group of 10 peoples, the aforementioned 3 plus the 7 original sponsors, namely, Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United States. Personally, I believe it would be wiser to start with only these seven sponsors and Norway. I give my reasons in this article which I would like included in the appendix, but I would willingly accept the judgment of your committee on this delicate point. The provision whereby the Convention itself would be authorized to invite other democracies would remain in the resolution.

#### POSITION OF SECRETARY DULLES ON AMENDED SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

These suggested amendments brought me this reply from Secretary Dulles, dated June 22:

"DEAR CLARENCE: Thank you for your letters of June 8 and June 18, 1956, concerning the current status of the resolution on the Atlantic Exploratory Convention. I appreciate the changes which you are recommending in light of our recent discussion.

"As you know, the administration maintains deep interest in steps designed to increase the unity of the Atlantic Community. We are presently engaged in an exploration, together with the other signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty, of ways and means of developing greater unity within the Community. For this purpose, a Ministerial Committee of Three was established by the NATO Foreign Ministers at their last meeting.

"As I indicated to you earlier, I cannot judge whether or not the Congress will wish to take on its own responsibility an initiative on the resolution calling for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention. I believe, however, that the executive branch of the Government should not be involved in consideration of this resolution at this time.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN FOSTER DULLES."

Two points seem to me to stand out in the above letter. First, the Secretary puts the responsibility for calling the Convention entirely on Congress. Second, he expresses no objection whatever to its supplementing the explorations of NATO's Committee of Three by adopting the amended resolution. In short, he gives Congress both a green light and the responsibility for going ahead. As I read his letter, he says that the Executive is exploring the problem through diplomatic channels in its jurisdiction, but is punctiliously refraining from advising the Congress on what it should do about exploring the problem through channels that are in its purview.

It results, as I said at the start, that the issue is now narrowed down to this: Is Congress to include or exclude exploration by the channel that brings in directly the people themselves, and follows the Convention approach that the American people have put their highest trust in?

#### OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS "IRRELEVANT"

I shall not take your time to answer the arguments of the opposition witnesses, unless you so desire by the questions you ask me. It seems to me they dodge the real issue. I have already answered their charges that the proposed Convention involves surrender of United States sovereignty. (See pp. 29-36 of the report of the 1955 hearings.) Their other charges are equally or even more ridiculously irrelevant, as, for example, the idea that this semiofficial Convention of a few democracies called to explore how to unite the Atlantic community more strongly is a scheme for world government. The opponents of this resolution are not concerned with the issue before us, but—at best—only with issues that cannot possibly arise until and unless the Convention recommends a plan for an Atlantic Federal Union. Since any such recommendation would require an amendment to the Constitution to be ratified, it is surely evident that when any such issues arise there will be ample opportunity to discuss them in the light of the concrete proposal made—not of the hobgoblins that opposing witnesses have conjured up.

## ACCORD WITH PRINCIPLES OF UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ASSURED

In this connection, I would point out that the authors of the amended resolution have amended the original text which ran:

"\* \* \* to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union."

So that it now reads:

"\* \* \* to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic, and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom."

The Atlantic Union Committee's willingness to accept this amendment is evidence of its desire to reassure everyone that the work of the Convention is not limited to exploring the possibility of federation and that the fears that have been expressed regarding it are groundless.

Many of us, however, and I among them, greatly regret that in amending this passage the good old American terms, "federal" and "union," were omitted. Their inclusion before did not confine the Convention to exploring federation, but did strengthen its psychological impact on the world. I, for one, still hope that the committee will retain the phrase, "federally or otherwise."

We all warmly welcome, of course, the provision that the Convention's recommendations shall be "in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States." We are more than willing that those who fear this Convention should have this reassurance; our purpose has always been to have the possibilities for peace and freedom that the principles of the United States Constitution contain explore on an Atlantic scale by the Convention approach that first discovered them. We sincerely hope that the amended text will remove all the misunderstandings that have arisen regarding the purpose of the resolution, and of its supporters.

## WHY ACT BEFORE ADJOURNING?

There remains the question: Why act now, with so little time before Congress adjourns? When we testified last July, we gave several reasons for doing so. The year's developments have made these reasons only more urgent. May I remind you of them in no I-told-you-so spirit, but simply to measure the growing need for action?

A year ago, we pointed to the uncertainty as regards foreign air bases under mere alliance. Consider what has happened since then in Iceland.

A year ago we said here that the Kremlin's present aim is to remove "the incentive its tough policy gave the West to unite, rearm, and remain on the alert." Since then at the Communist Party Congress last February "11 out of 12 main speakers," as General Gruenther stressed when he testified at your mutual security hearing May 31, "cited as the No. 1 objective of Soviet foreign policy the dismemberment of NATO." Consider all the Kremlin has done since then, its tricky reduction in armed forces, its Mideast moves, its downgrading of Stalin. No wonder General Gruenther warned you: "I think the next 5 years are going to be even more difficult, because the Soviets are getting much more clever in their cold war tactics."

A year ago we said here that "the mere fact that the United States had called a Convention to explore, among other possibilities, the soul-stirring possibility of forming a Federal United States of the free world would suffice to put the American Revolution again on the march." Consider the answer General Gruenther gave on May 31 when your distinguished chairman, Senator George, asked him what would be the effect "if \* \* \* there should arise a belief in the NATO members of Western Europe that there would be a probability that the United States and Canada would become parties in a federated union."

General Gruenther, who is in position to know and who weighs his words answered at once: "I would say that if the United States were willing to make that kind of offer it would definitely have a favorable influence on the NATO members." I would add that, from all the evidence we get, this would be particularly true in Germany, where aging Chancellor Adenauer is fighting so difficult and important a battle for the West.



## TO SPUR REVOLT IN SATELLITES

A year ago we said here that one "reason why the Kremlin is now all milk and honey is that it knows how vulnerable it is to the revolutionary forces that the mere calling of this Convention just now would set in motion." Consider what has happened since then in Poland.

A year ago we said here that though all recognize that we need a position of strength, we neglect the fact that "the kind of strength that Moscow respects the most and that costs us the least is the proverbial strength that lies in union." Before Moscow began making a cult of collective leadership, we pointed out that the Kremlin not only had long made "a fetish of unity," but counted on disunion as the Achilles' heel of the West. And we added:

"If you call this convention, Stalin's successors will get the surprise of their lives—a surprise that may well make them doubt even Marx. For them they will see these "cutthroat capitalists" sitting down together to explore the possibility of forming an economic as well as a military and political union. Sooner and better than anyone, the Kremlin can be counted on to see that this Convention, if it resulted in union, would result in increasing the strength of the West far more swiftly and overwhelmingly than the addition of Germany does, or anything else could possibly do."

Considering the subsequent downgrading of Stalin, I stand on this forecast that by moving toward union now, we can make the Communists downgrade Marx himself.

A year ago we expressed here that the Kremlin aims to win by fostering a depression rather than launching a world war. Today I would add that I fear it is plotting now to bring widespread unemployment in the West by having Europe's Mideast oil supply cut from it.

Secretary Dulles may be right in believing that the Kremlin is really losing control over foreign Communist parties. But if this is true, this picture of weakening communism can hasten relaxation and disunity in the West, thus exposing the Atlantic Community all the more to a depression. Communism would gain far more from depression than it risks losing by the present apparent weakening in its control over foreign Communist parties.

## KREMLIN MAY STRIKE DURING UNITED STATES ELECTION CAMPAIGN

If this weakening really grows serious, it may well stimulate the Kremlin to divert attention and restore its authority, not necessarily by the classical method of a foreign war, but rather by confronting us suddenly with the dilemma of either appearing before the world as willing to risk H-bomb world war for "oil imperialism"—as many uncommitted nations would see it—or risking an economic crash through loss of Mideast oil.

Certainly we can count on the Kremlin to take all the advantage it can of the uncertainty in Atlantic leadership that will result during the rest of this year from the President's second illness and the election campaign.

If Congress approves the Atlantic Convention before plunging into that campaign, the world will regard it as a move from strength; it will cause consternation in the Kremlin and rouse explosive new hope behind the Iron Curtain; it can turn communism's present weakness into a rout. But if Congress defers until next year the decision to call this Convention, we risk losing these advantages. And certainly we shall lose them if Congress waits to be forced by disaster to call it, for the world has little respect for moves that are made from weakness. Since surely you would call this Convention after catastrophe fell, why not call it now, in time to prevent it and turn the tide toward peace and freedom? Why leave the grave problem of Atlantic unity to be explored only by NATO's "three wise men"—a committee which one of its members, Foreign Secretary Pearson, of Canada, modestly calls the "three blind mice"?

THE ISSUE: EXPLORATION BY THE EXECUTIVE ONLY, OR BY CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE, TOO?

This brings me back, in conclusion, to the issue with which I began. Here is a problem to which, as President Eisenhower truly says, the American contribution is "of the utmost importance." Can that contribution possibly be made to the fullest extent if Congress leaves it entirely to the Executive and excludes from the explorers the people who are alone in position to explore it most fully?



We live at the dawn of the air atomic age. We are racing toward its high noon, and must explore somehow the political problems it brings. With the greatest respect for the executive branch of the Government, I ask you: Did we get the airplane by having the Executive instruct the Wright brothers on how to solve the problem? Did we find the secret of harnessing atomic energy by having the Executive instruct the scientists on how to explore it, and what to do from day to day—as it does its diplomatic appointees?

With all respect, I ask a second question: The problem of uniting the democracies effectively has been explored through diplomatic and ministerial channels for many years. Much good has resulted; but what has been done through these channels that can be compared to the enduring success achieved by the convention method when last we tried it between democracies, far back in 1737 at Philadelphia?

I ask a final question, with no less respect: The danger that results from unsuccessful exploration of how to unite the Atlantic community is grave indeed, but who will suffer the most from failure, the executive branch or the private citizen? Did the last depression cut down the number of jobs in the executive department, reduce anyone there to selling apples on the street? In the last war how many people were killed, and how many of these came from private life?

It is the private citizens who pay in taxes, liberty, and life, and it is they who have produced the great inventions, in the fields of political science as well as physical science. Are they to be excluded from exploring this problem of the utmost importance? Or will Congress have it explored by the key unit in the American system, whether political or economic—the individual citizen—and by the convention method that produced our greatest success—the Federal Constitution?

This, and this alone, I submit, is the issue now.

One final word: It may be said that there is not time enough left for Congress to act on it before adjournment. Surely that depends on leadership, and surely there is time for your committee to give Congress an opportunity to act by reporting this resolution favorably as soon as possible. This we trust you will do.

Senator HUMPHREY. You and I have had some discussions about this privately. I would like to get down on paper, in sequence, as to why you feel it ought to be so restricted.

Mr. STREET. I would stress, Senator, that this is my personal opinion, and that I would be quite willing and complimented to accept the judgment of your committee. I am certain that the Atlantic Union Committee would.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is all.

Senator GREEN. The last witness is Hon. Thomas H. Burke.

**STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS H. BURKE, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS; MEMBER, BOARD OF GOVERNORS, ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. I am a member of the board of governors of the Atlantic Union Committee. I would have much preferred if our president, Mr. Elmo Roper, had been able to attend. However, he found that it was impossible for him to be with you here today, and I am attempting to fill his place.

The Atlantic Union Committee has long believed that what is essential in this resolution is the meeting of the Convention for which it provides, and not the exact phraseology of the resolution. To make this clear, I will read a statement of policy relating to our attitude toward the text of the resolution formally adopted by our board of governors. We are prepared to support any text which accords with the five essential elements listed in this statement as follows:

1. That the Convention be sponsored by either the President or Congress of the United States, preferably the latter.

2. That only the reasonably experienced democracies be asked to participate, and that the number asked to participate should be held to a number small enough to enhance the chances for early success.

3. That the delegates be officially appointed but that they be uninstructed by their governments so that they shall be free to act in accordance with their own individual consciences.

4. That, whatever the phraseology, it should not be such as to preclude any proposal—including outright federation but certainly not limited to that—which, in the wisdom of the Convention, was the most practicable step.

5. That the findings of the Convention could only be recommendations, later to be accepted or rejected by the respective governments; and this would, of course, include the necessary steps if the adoption of any suggestion involved an amendment to the United States Constitution.

These elements we feel to be essential are stated in very broad terms, and allow plenty of scope for changes in the text of the resolution which this committee may believe to be desirable.

#### SUPPORT FOR REVISED RESOLUTION

An amended text or a suggested amended text of the resolution, which we feel falls clearly within this framework, has been circulated to members of your committee, I believe.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I just interrupt at this point so that everybody will know that this revision is something that I personally worked on considerably, because I felt that in the original resolution there was language which was restrictive.

Furthermore, I thought it was important that people understand that this should be within the constitutional principles and processes of our own Government.

Thirdly, I can well understand why the President, in view of our delicate international and foreign relations, would not want to be the sponsor as such, because it may very well have developments which would not be conducive to the foreign policy of our country as announced. Therefore, I felt we ought not to pin this responsibility on the President.

Furthermore, I thought we ought to be primarily thinking in terms of how you implement and strengthen NATO. I want to be very frank about it. I am deeply concerned about NATO, and everybody else is. I want NATO to survive.

I do not want to be one of those who is joining up with the forces of tyranny who are out to dismember NATO. The major opponent of NATO is the Soviet Union, and I will have no truck with that kind of thinking, because I happen to believe that NATO is vital for the defense of this beloved country of ours, and I gather that 99 percent of the people feel the same way, at least the Representatives in Congress do.

Mr. BURKE. That is right, Senator. And also, as to the legislative procedures, I think those who understand legislative procedures realize there is practically no bill or resolution ever introduced in Congress

which finally comes out of the committee as it was originally introduced.

#### GREATER UNITY URGED

The Atlantic Union Committee is prepared to support this amended resolution. It is not everything we would like to have, but we feel that it is a compromise that would be acceptable to us. My colleague, Mr. Streit, will develop, or has developed, in detail our position on these changes.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the disunity among the Atlantic democracies is derived directly from their peoples. Greater unity among these peoples cannot be achieved by governments alone through diplomatic action. To be adequate to meet our needs in the conflict with Communist imperialism, such greater unity must be developed among the people themselves.

I might say, parenthetically, that that theme was developed in questioning with another witness here this morning, and I quite agree with the lady that there must be a great deal more discussion among people.

From the number of witnesses who have appeared against Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 today, we might infer that the opposition is stronger in numbers and weight than its supporters. I believe that the statements filed here today from the AFL-CIO, the Farmers Union, and other organizations, along with the testimony and statements filed in the hearings of this committee last July, give ample proof that such is not the case.

You can be sure that a wide body of opinion and many eminent leaders urge you to report favorably this "prudent proposal," as Gen. George C. Marshall called it in announcing his support of it.

It must be remembered that this hearing was scheduled at the request of opponents of the resolution, and we are limiting our testimony to two short statements relating to developments which have occurred since the last hearings in an effort to make sure that the opponents have every opportunity to be heard.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to come before you and present our views. I strongly urge that the committee act favorably upon this resolution before adjournment of this Congress.

Senator GREEN. Do you have any further questions?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would want to mention this.

#### MOVES TO STRENGTHEN NATO

As I understand it, NATO has a subcommittee, the so-called Three Wise Men, which is studying the expansion of NATO.

Mr. BURKE. I understand so.

Senator HUMPHREY. We also passed last year a resolution which provided for parliamentarians from the countries associated with NATO to meet together on NATO problems.

We had a similar resolution before the Foreign Relations Committee this year.

Mr. BURKE. Isn't that meeting scheduled for next November?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct.

This is the third level. You have executive representatives, parliamentary or congressional representatives, and the resolution to which you are directing your attention is the people's representatives.

Mr. BURKE. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it ought to be noted for the record, that there are already two groups meeting on improvements or developments within NATO—parliamentarians and executive officials—and now this resolution is directed toward the basic sovereign power, which is the people, the representatives of the people.

Mr. BURKE. To explore what can be done between the peoples; yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would only say this for those who are in opposition, that they should know that already the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State, has authorized our participation in further exploratory meetings on NATO through executive officials.

Mr. BURKE. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. The Congress already authorized last year, and has before it this year authorization for parliamentary exchanges among NATO members. Your resolution goes to the third area—the basic sovereign power of the Republic, the people of the nations within the NATO organization—to explore improvements and developments within the NATO structure; is that correct?

Mr. BURKE. That is right, Senator.

Senator GREEN. That concludes this hearing.

I thank the witnesses who appeared, and I also thank those who came and were interested enough to listen. I have no doubt we all profited by it.

The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

(The following statements and letters were submitted for insertion in the record:)

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF  
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,  
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1956.

HON. JAMES MURRAY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I thank you for sending me a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, dealing with a proposed conference of representatives of the democracies supporting the North Atlantic Treaty.

This resolution was considered by the appropriate executive body of the AFL-CIO, together with a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 216, which was sent me by Congressman Harrison A. Williams, Jr., dealing with somewhat the same subject.

I am glad to be able to inform you that the AFL-CIO is entirely in accord with the principle underlying the proposals of these resolutions.

From the time that the North Atlantic Treaty was initiated, the American labor movement has been on record in support of the necessary military defense of Western democracies against the possibility of aggression. We have, however, at the same time insisted that the nonmilitary parts of the treaty should receive more consideration than has hitherto been accorded to them. On a number of occasions the representatives of the AFL-CIO have called for the implementation particularly of article 2 of the treaty, which deals with these matters.

The most recent example of this is the following quotation from the resolution on foreign policy, adopted by the AFL-CIO Convention held in New York City, December 5-9, 1955:

"This implementation of the London-Paris accords should be combined with a program to enable NATO to fulfill not only its primary purpose as a military defense body but, in addition, as an organ for greater economic and political cooperation in advancing peace, human rights, and improved living standards."

In the spirit of this position and because your exploratory convention is not committed to any definite formula, the AFL-CIO can express agreement with the objectives which your group seeks.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY, *President.*

APRIL 26, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: We are taking this means of expressing our views concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. This resolution proposes a conference of representatives of industrialized democratic nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with a view to broadening the basis of supranational cooperation to include economic and social policies in addition to security.

Over a long period National Farmers Union has supported all efforts of the Congress to promote, encourage, facilitate, and assist the economic growth and development of the free and democratic nations. The basic premise underlying all our testimony before the various congressional committees on legislation, the objective of which is to strengthen the democratic world, is the deep-seated desire for peace which is grounded in farm areas of the Nation.

We have long urged the establishment of a democratic world economic union, composed of nations that will subscribe to the kind of democratic rights and privileges set forth in the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights. Such an economic union of democratic nations, we feel, would aid materially in the rapid development and growth of free world economies and even more importantly bring us all toward peace.

We shall not attempt to elaborate further in this communication concerning the operation of such a union of democratic nations, primarily because the records of hearings before your committee already contain our views. We do want to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 because we feel a conference of representatives of the more highly developed democracies that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would be a step in the right direction.

In the conference proposed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 where representatives are not committed to any proposal and are free to explore the whole area of our mutual interests, the emphasis should be directed primarily toward the formation of an economic union, as the only secure base for free world security.

In connection with the meeting called for by the resolution, and in connection with any further actions initiated as a result of the meeting, full consideration is not only warranted but essential regarding both the sensitivities and the de facto interests in the proceedings of other democratic nations that are not members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This includes such nations as the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and the Latin American countries.

The revamped and broadened NATO must be fashioned and looked upon as an instrumentality to broaden and expand the economic opportunities of all the democratic nations not as a preclusive industrial elite grouping. Within such a framework of acknowledged responsibility, there appear to be no overweening objections to the development of regional economic pacts. On the contrary the NATO Economic Union envisioned by the resolution by strengthening and securing the industrialized western democracies would put them on a stronger footing to aid and assist other democratic nations to become partners in a democratic world economic union.

The benefits of an economic union in the revised NATO charter should be extended to nations outside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We understand that proponents of the resolution are in accord with our views along this line.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BAKER,  
*Assistant to the President, National Farmers Union.*

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE PROGRAM BOARD OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF  
BUFFALO AND ERIE COUNTY, N. Y., AT ITS MEETING ON MAY 11, 1956

Whereas both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have said that it is now time to develop the economic and political potentiality of NATO; and

Whereas most of our NATO allies have for some months been pressing such action; and

Whereas it is of cardinal importance that the moral power of the democratic West unite effectively behind some responsible effort to explore how best to preserve and advance self-government; and

Whereas the statement of our Secretary of State in New York City, April 23, indicates a forward looking attitude toward world affairs, away from war and nuclear menace toward a more orderly way of international life: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Program Board of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, having previously urged the immediate passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, to call an exploratory convention of citizen delegates from the principal western democracies, we do hereby convey to the Secretary of State of the United States our approval of his statement that this Nation is willing to join with other NATO countries in an exploration of ways and means to develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in ways more than military; and we commend the purpose to strengthen the economic and cultural forces of these nations; and we pray that unified action, if achieved, may extend to the benefit of all peoples everywhere.

---

(Copy of Letter Sent to the President, Secretary of State, Senator George,  
and Others)

THE COUNCIL OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,  
*New York, N. Y. June 12, 1956.*

Senator IRVING M. IVES,  
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR IVES: The Department of Christian Social Relations of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, at its annual meeting on June 5, 1956, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution urging prompt and favorable action on the resolution now pending in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee which provides: "That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they name delegates to meet in convention with the delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic, and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom."

We believe that this resolution is the most effective means available for meeting the change in the international picture; that it is consistent with the address made by Secretary of State Dulles in New York on April 23; and with the recent testimony of General Gruenther before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

As Christian churchmen, we further believe that this resolution, which seeks to implement article II of the North Atlantic Treaty, has definite religious implications. Necessary as arms are for our physical preservation in the present situation, we believe that arms alone can never assure freedom and peace. These goals can be secured only as men of good will unite to secure them, not merely in military alliances but through economic, social, and political union.

The proposed resolution does not involve acceptance of any blueprint of that union. It does provide for an exploratory convention. We believe that an exploration of the possibilities of a closer union should go forward at the earliest possible moment, and we urge that you use your influence to further prompt congressional action.

Respectfully yours,

LELAND B. HENRY, *Executive Director.*

## ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SENATE OF CANADA

June 29, 1950, 4 days after aggression began in Korea, the Canadian Senate passed with a single dissenting vote the following Atlantic Union resolution introduced by Senator W. D. Euler:

*"Resolved, That the Senate of Canada do approve of the calling of a convention of delegates from the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty and representing the principal political parties of such democracies, for the purpose of exploring how far their peoples and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of federal union."*

---

## STATEMENT BY MRS. CHASE S. OSBORN, OF SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

Since testifying in favor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 last July, I have spent 10 weeks in West Germany studying and promoting western unity. Among those Germans who talked with me were outstanding leaders in the Government, members of the opposition, and many distinguished private citizens. A wish that my report be placed on record has been expressed by a number of Members of this Congress.

Among members of the Chancellor's party, members of other parties in his coalition, and many private citizens I found an eagerness—sometimes almost frightening—for a bona fide exploration of means to make NATO more than military and to create a permanent tie between West Germany and the free West. This eagerness was the result of fear of a resurgence of nationalism, centering around unification; and fear of Soviet infiltration leading toward a coup, as happened in Czechoslovakia.

The line of the Socialist Party was abandonment of hope of reunification through NATO and willingness to take chances on direct talks with the Kremlin, which, after all, was the only authority that had the power to deliver.

I was in Bonn when the German delegation returned from the talks at Geneva last October. In Government circles there was a hope, at first, that the Socialists would see the light as the Government saw it; that there was no longer any alternative to a policy of closer unity with a strong free West, and patience regarding reunification. Instead the Socialists hardened in their opposition: there was no hope for reunification while West Germany remained in NATO; therefore, they were for withdrawal from NATO and negotiations with Moscow.

This split in leadership has persisted; and public opinion has moved steadily toward the Socialist side.

The eagerness to make NATO more than military was based on the fact that NATO has appeared to stand for nothing more than military power. Because the German people fear militarization, NATO has been unpopular among the people. Soviet propaganda has made the most of this.

The eagerness to make NATO into something with the strength of permanence quickly was based on the feeling of need to provide something to divert German youth from a new burst of nationalism. European Union had kept German nationalism in bounds. When EDC died, nationalism at once, naturally, began to surge into the vacuum. Western Union, patched up as a substitute, is only a treaty and has no popular appeal; for the Germans are realistic about treaties. When I arrived, talking about American citizen activity for some kind of integration on an Atlantic scale, one leader exclaimed: "Providence sent you." Another said, "This means our life. I have influence. I will open any door to you."

Soviet Ambassador Zorin came to Bonn while I was there. He was Soviet Ambassador to Czechoslovakia at the time of the liquidation of that Republic. He brought with him the man who was his right hand in the shanghaiing of the Czech Republic. The German Government openly expressed its deep distrust; individuals expressed their fear.

There has been some increase in Communist membership in the ranks of German labor, even where working conditions have been much improved; but the main advance of communism has been through increased trade and political maneuvers. The road to reunification through the West has been deliberately blocked. The road to reunification through the overthrow of Adenauer and withdrawal from NATO has been made tempting. The Kremlin, recognizing



Chancellor Adenauer as invulnerable, concentrates on cutting the ground from under him politically and has made frightening progress. This is in addition to the disadvantages inherent in the dilemma of his position.

Propaganda paints NATO as still merely militaristic. Disadvantages of membership are driven home: it requires remilitarization of West Germany; the heavy cost of rearming; it is an insuperable block to reunification, according to the Kremlin's terms. The weaknesses of NATO have been enlarged, actually, and magnified even more in propaganda. On Dr. Adenauer's platform of stronger ties with a stronger West, which seems to have lost validity, it is all too likely that the Chancellor will be shorn of his power in 1957.

Moscow propaganda on the other hand paints the fruitful possibilities of East Germany's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact (a true specimen of phony), West Germany's withdrawal from the Atlantic Pact; and Germany, reunified, in a larger all-European pact, a neutral zone including, among other neutrals, Tito's Yugoslavia. This is the new alinement that the Socialist Party of West Germany looks toward in its policy, which it set forth last week just as Adenauer's temporary triumph in passing the conscription law was being hailed by us.

This triumph of Dr. Adenauer is good. He is magnificent, even in the errors to which he is driven by desperate straits. But even this triumph is a deepening danger. For Germany is going to be rearmed at his insistence. That rearming is unpopular and will contribute to the Chancellor's downfall. Unless we act strongly, in some way, immediately, to try to tie this rearmed Germany with the free West tightly, we shall leave the door wide open for a new German despotism. This might start out neutral, perhaps under a Tito, independent of the Kremlin, fattening on what it could leech from both sides as Tito has fattened; but if it is despotism, as Moscow certainly plots it to be, it will, like Tito's, be closer to despotism in the East than to self-government in the West. Unless we act, immediately, to try to find a means to tie the rearming German people to us beyond the accident of a change in government, we shall by our inactivity criminally allow the balance of industrial power to slip from self-government of the West to the despotic system of the Kremlin, just as, at this same critical moment, we helplessly watch the power source of Europe and our European defenses slip into the hands of Moscow's expanding imperialism.

Based on what I learned in West Germany, it is my impression that the West German Government, and the administration in the United States, have consistently minimized the continuing grave losses of the Adenauer administration. Time after time their optimistic interpretations have been disproved by later developments. The optimism is human. In any land or language, the "ins" must not admit losses or they will soon be "outs." Fortunately there are newspapers like the New York Times and Christian Science Monitor that publish facts, no matter how stark they are; and these nonpartisan reports have progressively compounded the fears that I brought back from my survey. Unless a miracle occurs, Adenauer, with his conscription and patience about reunification, will be replaced in 1957 by other leadership with which the Kremlin is already bargaining.

It is within our power to try to bring about a miracle. We can make Dr. Adenauer's policy completely valid again and more appealing to the German people whose vote will soon decide this all-important question.

Our responsibility is clear. It is immediate. We must lead strongly, with no more procrastination, to make the free West again a strong free West. In order to appeal to the people of Germany (and the people of Iceland; and the people of the United States) NATO must be made strong in spirit and in truth not only militarily but ideologically. It must have a great, an appealing cause. It has this cause—the cause of freedom. Anyone, even the Soviets, can cry "Peace. Peace." NATO must blazon forth that it stands for peace with freedom.

The regaining of strength by the free West will have no rousing appeal for the people of Germany (or the people of Iceland, or the people of the United States) if it comes slowly, cautiously, inhibitedly, even out of such good things as questionnaires from diplomat to diplomat. If it is wished that NATO hold the people of Germany with it—and the people of Iceland and the people of the United States—something drastic, dramatic, must be done to draw their attention, arouse their interest, and possibly command their earnest cooperation.

The effort to create a European Defense Community did this for Germany. The long, drawn-out attempt, though it seems to have failed, was justified. It was awakening. We have learned from it.

Now the time is here to try something in the place of EDC—to see what uninstructed, nondiplomatic representatives of Atlantic democracies can search out



around a table in an attempt to create some kind of framework by consent of all concerned that will keep rearmed Germany as our permanent partner in freedom—and try it before Germany's rearmed nationalism enlarges swiftly toward the high rivalry that brought about World Wars I and II.

Coming back from Germany at the beginning of 1956, I brought this great hope: The possibility that the Germans might eagerly join with us in a new, high exploration of self-government; the belief that this might be possible if we could only start them thinking in this direction quickly—before the threatening storm of nationalism breaks.

Each week the great hope has grown less. Within the last few weeks two new nationalistic parties, both for an armed neutral Germany, have been formed. They are small, but show which way the wind is blowing.

Constructive action deferred to 1957, after the German people are set in parties pledged to withdraw West Germany from NATO, may well be too late. July 1956 is the time for the self-governing peoples to get the feel of being called together to try to work out some mutually satisfactory and dependable unity. NATO has neglected its peoples too long. Here is a way to demonstrate to the Kremlin and the watching world that in the West we, the people, really govern. The Warsaw Pact is a thin pact of dictators. The Atlantic aggregation is a vital functioning community. Truth can triumph over propaganda. And this will be dramatic truth, if delegates of the peoples of the nations of the free West meet to discuss how much each would be willing to adjust in order to be certain in any future trouble that we shall be together dependably on the side of freedom.

Since I came back the outlook has swiftly worsened. Any day we may pass the point of no return. The measure of the conviction of urgency that came from what I saw in West Germany is in the fact that it has kept me walking the Halls of Congress and working day and night since this session began to try to hasten passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

---

#### GENERAL GRUENTHER FAVORS ATLANTIC CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Testifying on the Mutual Security Act of 1956 at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in executive session on May 31, General Gruenther was questioned by Senators George, Fulbright, and Humphrey regarding Atlantic Union and the Atlantic Exploratory Convention resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, House Concurrent Resolutions 72-80). The questions and answers below are reproduced from the report of the hearings on this act, released June 17.

"The CHAIRMAN. If, injected into this present picture, there should arise a belief in the NATO members in Western Europe that there would be a probability that the United States and Canada would become parties in a federated union, would that be divisive influence right now?

"General GRUENTHER. I would say that if the United States were willing to make that kind of offer it would definitely have a favorable influence on the NATO members.

"The CHAIRMAN. I would not want to say that the United States would be willing to do that because I presume that the men around this table would know better.

"General GRUENTHER. I was taking your question as posing a hypothetical situation.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, a hypothetical question. I just wanted to get your view on that point, looking at it from the standpoint of the Western European states.

"General GRUENTHER. I would say this, Senator. Anything that can be done to create in the minds of our NATO allies the belief that there is a mutuality of interests between the United States and Western Europe is all to the good. Any indications in that direction would be helpful. We must always bear in mind that United States participation in European affairs is something very new. Many of our Western European friends entertain the haunting fear that sooner or later we may pull back and leave them alone. All too often some of the public utterances of some of our prominent citizens give this impression.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### "ATLANTIC UNION

"Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you see any alternative to continued military preparation?

"General GRUENTHER. With conditions as we know them now, I can see no acceptable alternative.

"Senator FULBRIGHT. What do you think of Atlantic Union as an alternative? Do you support such an idea?

"General GRUENTHER. I think any feasible action which would improve unity within NATO is all to the good.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Senator HUMPHREY. Just this final question. You are familiar with the proposal for a NATO convention, that is, for representatives of NATO countries to get together and talk over the possibility of strengthening NATO.

"General GRUENTHER. Yes.

"Senator HUMPHREY. There has been a resolution introduced here in the Senate—Senate Concurrent Resolution 12—and there have been some recent revisions of it. The last revision was merely to suggest that—

" 'The President is requested to transmit to other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the proposal of Congress that they name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from other democracies, to explore and report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs and their joint defense.'

"How do you feel about such an exploratory convention?

"General GRUENTHER. I feel that the bringing together of representatives of the NATO nations is desirable.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think it would be helpful in terms of political unity of our NATO Pact countries?

"General GRUENTHER. Yes; I think any decision that would improve mutual understanding of the problems of the NATO nations would be helpful."

---

#### STATEMENT OF H. LIVINGSTON HARTLEY, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

The testimony and statements of witnesses who opposed Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 at the hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations on July 29, 1955, contain many claims which are contrary to fact.

Seven of these claims, which appear to be the most important, are considered briefly below.

##### *1. The resolution entails surrender of sovereignty and of individual rights*

This claim is false. The resolution provides only for a convention to explore to what extent the people concerned might further unite, and make a public report of its findings. Any action to implement recommendations of the convention which might involve the exercise of the sovereignty of the American people, the powers of the United States Government or the individual rights of the American people would require amendment of the Constitution. It would consequently require acceptance by two-thirds of each House of Congress as well as acceptance by an overwhelming majority of the American people. No such amendment could be adopted unless it was clearly believed by both Congress and the American people to serve the national interest.

To oppose the resolution with this argument is not only to distort its purpose as clearly set forth in its text. It is also to betray mistrust of the Constitution, of our governmental processes and of the wisdom of both Congress and the American people.

##### *2. The resolution is contrary to the will of the American people*

This claim has no factual foundation. The only practicable way to determine its validity is to report the resolution to Congress for its consideration. Unless those who make this claim mistrust the wisdom of Congress, they should not fear its consideration of the resolution.

##### *3. Passage of the resolution by Congress would imply that an Atlantic Union is desirable*

This is not true. Passage of the resolution would imply only that a convention to explore and to report to what extent the peoples of a number of democracies might further unite is desirable. The need for such unity among free peoples

has repeatedly been stressed by General Eisenhower as well as by his predecessor, President Truman. Such a convention is the only practicable means available of determining the attitude of the peoples concerned as to how such unity can be attained.

*4. This resolution is a world government proposal*

The falsity of this claim is made clear by the text of the resolution. The resolution calls only for a convention to explore and report to what extent the peoples represented by delegates might further unite. It provides only for delegates from NATO democracies to be included in the convention and stipulates that only democracies may be invited to participate.

*5. The ultimate aim is world government*

This claim is frequently supported by quotations from individual members of the Atlantic Union Committee. The members of this committee, like those of most other national organizations, are divided in their view as to what is ultimately desirable in some future century. The Atlantic Union Committee has taken no position on this theoretical question. Its position has been to support this and previous resolutions calling for an exploratory convention of delegates from NATO democracies.

Many thoughtful Americans subscribe to the view that the course of history indicates that the world will ultimately become politically unified. If that view should prove correct, the world would ultimately be unified either by force beneath a dictatorship or else by voluntary agreement. The only relation of this resolution to such an ultimate outcome is that its passage could result in decreasing the danger that the Soviet Union or some other totalitarian regime will eventually succeed in unifying the world by force. Its passage could thus contribute directly toward maintenance of our free institutions throughout the future.

*6. The United States would be outvoted*

This claim could have no valid basis until it was known whether the report of the convention would include recommendations for some new organization, whether such recommendations would be accepted by the governments concerned, what form that organization would have, whether or not it would comprise any body in which votes were cast, how many countries it would comprise and how such votes might be distributed among them.

If the question of being outvoted in any such organization should ever actually arise, it would be determined in accordance with our Constitution and our national interests by Congress and the American people. The only question raised by this resolution is whether the extent to which some democratic peoples might further unite should be explored.

*7. A closer union would weaken resistance to communism by weakening nationalism*

If this argument were more than a slogan, it would apply also to NATO in which unity in defense planning, command structure, and control of airfields and logistics has been achieved. If it were valid, we should withdraw from NATO, SEATO, and from the Rio de Janeiro Treaty in order to stimulate nationalism here and in Europe, Asia, and South America.

In actual fact, NATO has strengthened resistance to communism, politically and psychologically as well as in military terms. As a result, a principal Communist objective is to destroy NATO. The Communists, moreover, are actually promoting nationalism in most of the free world in order to weaken resistance to communism.

Commonsense and practical experience both indicate that if the principal NATO nations can further unite they will further strengthen resistance to communism, politically, psychologically, and in military terms.

---

EDINBURG, TEX., June 22, 1956.

Re Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As an American citizen that is determined to use my persuasion to keep my country free from all foreign commitments, that would jeopardize, infringe or in any way interfere with the American Constitution and its protecting Bill of Rights, I wish to enter my solemn protest against this resolution

that has been conceived by international-minded dupes, for the purpose of calling an exploratory convention, to take this country into the Atlantic Union through a back door.

There are millions of American citizens today that are tired and fed up with being taxed to the point of confiscation to support Communist fronts of this kind, and we beseech your committee to report unfavorable on Resolution No. 12.

I remain

Most respectfully,

J. H. BERRY.

I most respectfully request that this protest be printed in your official hearings.

McALLEN, TEX., *June 24, 1956.*

In re Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12

HON. WALTER GEORGE,

*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,*

*Washington, D. C.*

SENATOR GEORGE: As an American citizen, I request that this protest against the exploratory convention to expand NATO as an Atlantic community be entered into the official hearings:

You are not only violating your oath of office to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States of America, but you are serving the objectives of the Kremlin, in holding such a meeting.

Any such consolidation of sovereignties would violate and destroy independence and individual liberty in our Republic.

It would destroy our bill of rights, and the unchangeable rules of justice, truth, and good faith inherent in our Constitution, upon which our freedom and liberty, and those of our children, rest.

Millions of Americans are fed up with the monotonous reiteration of the fantastic idea of world government, and will fight to the last breath to preserve the Constitution of the United States of America.

No back-door entrance to world government. Observe your sacred oath.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARCIA C. J. MATTHEWS.

GLEN ROCK, N. J., *July 6, 1956.*

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,*

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: If a public hearing is held to review Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, I should like as an individual American housewife, who is too busy to come to Washington, to write into the hearing record the suggestion that the currently obsolete resolution be discarded as impractical, time-wasting, unrealistic, and in danger of permanently damaging the rights of us, the people.

To permit an imaginary union is as fantastic as permitting a physician, in the light of present-day, scientific progress, to introduce RH negative blood into the constitution of an individual with RH positive findings. When we know that the principal political party is communism in some of the countries who sponsor an Atlantic Union, it would seem like preparation for homicide and suicide for Congress to sign an order for Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, beginning with paralysis of democratic government.

Instead of wasting time on the unrealistic ideas contained in the resolution, expecting people in America to sign away their Bill of Rights, let's progress in setting a better example for other countries and ourselves by acting as responsible individuals and urging the adoption of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1 and H. J. Res. 41), which has already slept too long in committee. This Congress-strengthening amendment seems the best antidote for creeping communistic thinking, and a certain fortifier for the continuation of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The very idea (which is contained in S. Con. Res. 12) of allowing the President of the United States, or the Congress, to stipulate to other countries how their

delegates should be named for an exploratory convention disregards the political privilege of "other democracies" which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty.

With trust in God that Congress will act to strengthen our spiritual unity between peoples and nations, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DORIS B. PARKER.

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,  
Washington 6, D. C., July 9, 1956.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,  
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: This office has been advised that a hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 is scheduled for July 11 at 10 a. m. As it is impossible for the chairman of the American Sovereignty Committee of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to be present at that hearing, I am submitting a statement on behalf of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution which I trust will be brought to the attention of the Senate committee.

Our society is unalterably opposed to any treaty or other form of international agreement which will impair the sovereignty of the United States of America or which will in any way jeopardize the constitutional rights of American citizens.

The position of our society in this matter is clearly set forth in a resolution adopted by the 65th Annual Congress of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution at Chicago, Ill., on May 25, 1955, and reaffirmed by the delegates to the 66th Annual Congress at Bolton Landing, N. Y., May 30, 1956.

The resolution referred to is quoted in its entirety:

"Whereas there was introduced in the Senate of the United States on February 9, 1955, by Senator Kefauver, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 which states: '*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President is requested to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union'; and,

"Whereas this is another form of the same proposal for Atlantic Union introduced in former sessions of Congress by Senator Kefauver; and

"Whereas the proponents of this resolution aim at expanding the present military alliance of NATO into a federal political union which requires the surrender of basic powers of our own President, the Congress and the States, to the Atlantic Union and makes drastic changes in our form of government; and

"Whereas the calling of delegates by our Government to explore the possibilities of a surrender of powers to form a superpolitical union places our Government in the position of favoring such a union; and

"Whereas a number of resolutions of like import and wording have been introduced into the House of Representatives by both Democrats and Republicans: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in congress assembled call upon their Senators and Representatives to vote against this Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 introduced in the Senate which paves the way to the surrender of our independence and sovereignty."

I trust that this statement on behalf of our society will be brought to the attention of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and that it will be given consideration by the members of that committee.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD L. PUTNAM,  
Executive Secretary.

DEFENDERS OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, INC.,  
*Washington, D. C., July 6, 1956.*

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Senator from Georgia,  
 Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,  
 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: The Defenders of the American Constitution present their compliments and request that this communication be made part of the record in the proceedings connected with the hearings on July 11, 1956, on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

We are unalterably opposed to the passage of this resolution and call upon all true Americans to work for its defeat.

Our objections are based particularly upon the Constitution of the United States, article X, of the Bill of Rights. There is no authority vested by the Constitution in any branch of the Federal Government to surrender any part of the sovereignty of the United States.

This being the obvious end in view in Resolution 12, which contemplates a first step in the direction of surrendering our sovereignty into the hands of a group of 14 nations, it is the duty of the Senate to defeat Resolution 12 upon these grounds. The power to give away our sovereignty rests with the people, and their wishes in the matter must be consulted by means provided in our basic law. All else is a subversion of the Constitution.

We firmly believe that to discuss ways and means of surrendering our national independence is an act leading to suicidal surrender of the tenets of our national self-preservation which we understand to be personal, God-given liberty, limited constitutional government, and national independence.

In this appeal we are within our constitutional right of petition, and we pray that God may so guide the hands of those responsible that the Constitution be preserved and defended, not violated, by those who have taken oath to defend it against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

Respectfully submitted.

P. A. DEL VALLE, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 10, 1956.*

CARL MARCY,  
*Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

The resolution as currently revised does not go as far as many in the Atlantic Union Committee would prefer, but it has the great merit of not limiting the proposed convention of freemen to any one type of solution whatsoever. Nor does it empower the convention to do more than offer solutions. In my opinion, the recent apparent change in Russia's foreign policy may well be regarded as dynamic in many quarters of the world, whereas that of the democracies may be labeled "static." To take such a step as that proposed by the resolution at this time would certainly reverse any losses we may have suffered among the democratically minded peoples of the world because of alleged barrenness of our policies. I do hope this resolution can be reported out favorably before adjournment.

ELMO ROPER,  
*President, Atlantic Union Committee.*

WILLIAMSVILLE, VT., *July 6, 1956.*

C. C. O'DAY,  
*Clerk, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,  
 United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. O'DAY: As you suggested, enclosed are 25 copies of statement for the public hearing on July 11, 1956, by the National Society for Constitutional Security in opposition to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, dated July 5, 1956.

My daughter is in the hospital so I cannot appear before the committee in person.

I will appreciate your cooperation in mailing me the proof of the hearing for possible correction in my statement before the record of the hearing is printed.

Yours sincerely,

ELISE FRENCH JOHNSTON,  
*Corresponding Secretary,*  
*National Society for Constitutional Security.*

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL SECURITY IN  
 OPPOSITION TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

The National Society for Constitutional Security is opposed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 in toto for the following reasons:

1. The military treaty called NATO has not lived up to the expectations of the American people. Events prove the growing trend of our allies to adopt neutralistic policies. The French have withdrawn much manpower from NATO's European strength. How many other allies are limiting new inductees or actually reducing the number of their regular soldiers? How many of our European allies have treaties of friendship and nonaggression with the U. S. S. R.? Our own Government makes executive agreements. How can the United States Senate keep track of secret agreements between our allies and the U. S. S. R.? The military situation is confused and unsatisfactory. The economic situation is even more discouraging.

2. Our lukewarm military allies are increasing their trade, travel, and cultural ties with the U. S. S. R. Perhaps this is inevitable. The socialistic governments of Europe have more resemblances to the Socialist Soviet Republics than they have to the United States of America. The European economic system is known as cartel capitalism which prohibits competition, limits production, and fixes prices. These are the first steps in establishing any totalitarian government, including the U. S. S. R. This cartel system is the inevitable rival of our unique system of free, competitive, private enterprise. In an economic union with Europe how could our system of private enterprise survive?

Our system of government is in large measure financed by tax revenues collected from successfully operated private enterprise. When we undermine our economic strength our system of government will suffer.

3. Our foreign enemies can save themselves the expense of a costly war if they can persuade us to commit national suicide. Two methods are possible; to destroy our national sovereignty or to destroy our economic strength, knowing political chaos would follow. Both of these terrible possibilities could eventually follow step by step from the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. Let the United States remain helpful but not helpless in the grasp of friend or foe.

The National Society for Constitutional Security urges our great Senate to oppose Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 and all other measures which would weaken United States sovereignty or endanger our great industries upon which American strength and prosperity depend.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS  
 AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.,  
 Washington 6, D. C., July 9, 1956.

STATEMENT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12, FAVORING THE CALLING OF AN  
 ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,

*Chairman, United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee.*

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., an organization of over 170,000 women actively engaged in business and the professions, functioning in 3,164 local clubs in the 48 States, Washington, D. C., Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, supports Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, favoring the calling of an Atlantic exploratory convention. The legislative platform, adopted at the federation's national convention held in Miami Beach, Fla., in July 1956, by representatives of its total membership directs in item II:

"Support of legislation within the framework of the United States Constitution to implement a foreign policy which promotes peace and national security and



an additional directive under item II to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

Our legislative steering committee has approved, and our federation supports Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 in the belief that the more unified the democracies of the world become, the greater their strength will be and the more influence they will have to prevent wars.

Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. ISABELLA J. JONES,  
*Chairman, National Legislation Committee.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
July 10, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Further hearings will be held Wednesday morning, July 11, on Senate Committee Resolution No. 12. I know that a proposed amended resolution has been circulated among some members of the committee by Senator Humphrey and I assume that consideration will be given to this proposal also.

In order that the committee may have a full record I am attaching hereto a copy of the letter of August 5, 1955, which I wrote to Mr. John Foster Dulles. This is for the purpose of clarifying my position on the resolution in the light of some objections that had been made by the Secretary of State. Also attached is letter from Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, of August 22, 1955, which is in response to my letter of August 5, 1955.

I would appreciate your having copy of my letter and Mr. Dulles' reply printed in the record at the beginning of the hearing as I feel information contained will be of benefit to the committee and to others interested in this proposal.

With kind regards,  
Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
*Washington, D. C., August 5, 1955.*

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
*Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY DULLES: There seems to be need of clarification of the basic purport of your letter of July 28 to Senator George, giving your view of the Atlantic Exploratory Convention Resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) which I introduced February 9 on behalf of a bipartisan group of 15 Senators. The Daily Digest of the Congressional Record for July 29 speaks of deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy, who read your letter to the Foreign Relations Committee that day, as "testifying in opposition to this resolution." The press has widely interpreted your letter as a negative or "chilling" reaction to the resolution.

In my view, however, you opened a new way to the Convention, namely that it be held under the auspices of the Congress instead of the President. The impression that you are opposed to the calling of an Atlantic exploratory convention comes from the difficulties you saw in having it officially called by the President. This interpretation, however, overlooks the constructive suggestion you then made for overcoming these difficulties by having the Congress rather than the Executive call the convention. I find nothing in your letter to indicate basic objection to the convention if called under the "less official auspices" of the Congress, but merely 1 or 2 indications of relatively minor improvements in the resolution that might be made in the latter event.

I base my view primarily on the second paragraph of your letter in which, after noting that our resolution "does not purport to commit the prospective delegations to advocacy" of any union, you express fear that "if the invitation to the Convention were made by the President of the United States, it would, I think, be inferred that he had accepted the practicability and general desirability of some such union," and you "question the wisdom of the Congress seeming to put the President in that position at the present time." But in your next sentence you add: "I therefore venture to suggest that if the Congress desires that a



convention be held to explore the desirability of a defense, economic, and political union of the United States with other countries, a way be found to hold the Exploratory Convention under less official auspices than is now suggested."

The resolution now suggests that Congress request the President to call the convention. The only convention I can imagine that could be called "under less official auspices" than that would be one called by the Congress acting on its own authority. A convention called by any other institution than the President or the Congress would be purely private. Since it would have no official character whatever, a private conference could not be the "less official" one of which your letter speaks.

Moreover, you speak also of the Congress calling it; obviously, any international meeting called by the Congress would have a certain official character. Yet, if the Congress acted merely under its own authority, the Convention it called would not be under the full official auspices of the United States Government, as would be one called by the President. Only a convention held under the authority of the Congress acting alone would seem to me to qualify as involving "less official auspices" than the one the resolution now proposes.

A little later in your letter you "suggest that it would be inappropriate for the President or the Congress to stipulate to other countries how their delegates should be named, and particularly that their delegates should 'include members of their principal political parties'." It would seem clear from this also that you envisage two types of convention—the type called by the President and the type called by the Congress—and that you believe that in neither case should there be any stipulation as to how other countries should name their delegates.

That you had in mind these two types of convention seems more evident from this: In a preceding paragraph you say that the resolution would limit the convention to seven sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty and you give this as a reason why "the President would, I believe, be reluctant" to call the convention, but this time your objection is confined only to the type of conference held under the official auspices of the Executive. With a deference to the Congress which I am sure all my colleagues will appreciate as I do, you do not so much as imply that if the Congress desires to explore the problem of further Atlantic unity, it, too, should necessarily be governed by the same considerations that affect the Executive.

My point, here, I repeat, is merely that your letter seems to envisage two types of convention, and that the Congress—thanks to the less official character of a convention it called—would appear to be in a more supple position to deal with the problem of exploring how further to unite the Atlantic community than would the Executive.

I would stress that I am not contending either for maintaining the resolution's clause as regards the North Atlantic Treaty sponsors, or against amending it to cover all present NATO members. There are good arguments for either solution—and also for other solutions. In my testimony at the hearings I sought to make clear that we do not put the present resolution text forward as something hard and fast; we are quite ready to consider sympathetically all constructive suggestions for its improvement.

This applies, of course, not only to the present point but to all the other suggestions you made in your letter. To be specific, I feel confident that none of the cosponsors of the resolution would object to omitting either the fourth preamble which, as you point out, has been obsolete by the subsequent admission of the Federal Republic of Germany to NATO, or the stipulations in the enacting clause regarding how other countries should name their delegates. I would merely point out in the latter connections that the provision that the delegates should "include members of their principal political parties" was intended to insure that the delegation from the United States should have the bipartisan character that befits the purpose of the convention and that has characterized the practice of previous administrations.

I regret that in suggesting the unsuitability of our telling other nations how to compose their delegations, you failed to point out that it would be altogether fitting for the resolution to stipulate that the American delegation should be bipartisan. I would certainly insist on this last point. The fact that there would be no difficulty in or hesitation at securing this bipartisanship if the Congress calls the convention is an added argument to me in favor of your suggestion that it, rather than the Executive, convoke the meeting and name the delegation from the United States.

The non-Communist sense in which our bipartisan group of cosponsors of the resolution intended this nonpartisan clause in the resolution surely is obvious to

you. I find it hard to understand why your letter should not only pay no attention to it but call attention instead to the fact that one of the largest of the many parties in France is the Communist Party. You must know that none of the sponsors of the resolution aimed at having any Communist delegate from any country included in the convention.

I would add that I regret, too, that your letter of the 28th appears to have been written without any knowledge of any of the testimony by supporters of the resolution at the hearing on July 25. I appreciate how overburdened you are just now, yet still it would seem to me that some attention might have been paid to their testimony. Had this been done, it would have been evident that they look with a most sympathetic eye on your principal suggestion, that the resolution be altered so that the Congress instead of the President call the convention.

I have felt constrained to bring out all these facts in detail in view of the widespread interpretation of your letter as being in opposition to the proposed convention, and not simply to certain details in the present resolution which its supporters are prepared to alter. In the circumstances, I would greatly appreciate knowing whether my own interpretation of your position is the correct one.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

---

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, August 22, 1955.

HON. ESTER KEFAUVER,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I have received, and carefully considered, your letter of August 5, commenting on my letter of July 28 to Senator George with reference to the Atlantic exploratory convention resolution (S. Con. Res. 12).

You referred to that letter as having been interpreted as indicating opposition to this resolution.

In a sense that is a correct interpretation. My letter was necessarily directed to the actual text of the pending resolution, and not to some hypothetical alternative, and was addressed primarily to problems which that resolution might create for the executive branch and in relation to the conduct of foreign affairs. For the reasons I gave, I expressed opposition to the passage of the resolution in its actual form. However, I did not intend thereby to express opposition to any exploration, pursuant to congressional initiative, of the possibilities of increased unity between some or all of the members of the Atlantic Community, as now most officially defined by the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty. That treaty itself provides, as your resolution recalls, that the parties thereto will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Increased unity as between all or some of the members of the Atlantic Community is now being sought on a number of fronts as, for example, through the North Atlantic Treaty Council itself; through the Brussels Treaty, as now amended by the London and Paris accords, and through the Coal and Steel Community. In this connection, I might mention that I understand that a delegation from the United States House of Representatives recently attended an interparliamentary conference on NATO in Paris, and that this conference recommended the formation of a continuing association, to which the legislative bodies of the member countries would annually send delegations.

I attach particular importance to steps already taken, and to those in contemplation, to bring about increased unity as between those peoples of Western Europe whose past divisions have been so frequently the cause of war, the last two of which wars have developed into world wars.

In general, I feel that from the standpoint of foreign affairs, any action taken by the Congress should take account of, and be designed to supplement, rather than to conflict or interfere with, existing efforts toward increased unity now being made by political organizations which are already in existence and going affairs. Also, I hope that the Congress would itself avoid any discrimination which would be deemed offensive to others with whom the United States seeks continuing and increasing cooperation.

If the Congress deemed it desirable that the possibilities of increased international unity be explored from still another viewpoint, that could, I surmise, be initiated by a congressional resolution which would not be subject to the objections mentioned above and in my letter of August 5. However, I myself have not attempted to draft such a resolution because the executive does not

itself feel that it would be wise for it to take an initiative in this matter at this time. I have, however, in an effort to be helpful to you and the other Congressmen interested in this approach, indicated certain considerations which, I hope, would be kept in mind.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

---

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., July 13, 1956.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Re Resolution 12, the Atlantic Exploratory Convention, I respectfully call to your attention the fact that you are pledged to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. For you to sponsor any form of world or semiworld government would be for you to break your oath of office. Your first loyalty is to the Constitution and not to the administration. I know that you are too loyal an American to break your oath of office and barter away the rights of the American people for political expediency or political profit.

I request that my letter be printed as a part of the official committee hearings.

Sincerely,

IMOGEN MCMURTRY.

---

STATEMENT BY HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM MICHIGAN

In the early 1880's the late, great Governor of my State, the Honorable Chase S. Osborn, then a young man, went to the small, frontier mining town of Florence, Wis., to publish a newspaper. His experiences there can well profit us all in our efforts to obtain a free and peaceful society, and their study is certainly appropriate to any consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 either in its original form or as amended along the lines suggested by Senator Humphrey.

When Governor Osborn arrived in Florence he found a town completely dominated by desperadoes. These gunmen made the rules to suit themselves and informed Mr. Osborn that he must do as they said. "If you leave us alone, we will leave you alone." The Governor pondered the situation and saw that he had a limited number of alternatives. He could challenge the outlaws and probably get himself shot. The outlaws were in too powerful a position to make successful opposition by any one man sensible. If he wished to stay in Florence peacefully, therefore, the easy way was to knuckle under. Mr. Osborn saw another alternative, however. It occurred to him that what one man could not do alone, a number could do jointly. He, therefore, grouped together the peace-loving, law-abiding citizens of the community and organized them into an effective unit which was capable of driving the outlaws out. It is important to note that in this way Mr. Osborn was able to live in Florence in peace, but he was also able to live there in freedom.

It may seem to some that little can be gained by comparing Florence in 1880 with the world in 1956, but principles do not change. Outlaws of the world today are too powerful. Should anyone doubt this, let him consider who it is that is responsible for the huge taxes which we pay for our own defense. Who is it that requires our young men to serve in the Armed Forces whether they wish to or not? Are not today's Communists much like the outlaws of another year, and are not we today facing the same problems which Governor Osborn faced? Some have advocated that we shoot it out, which he also considered but rejected. Some would do anything for peace. The Governor also could have had peace for the asking. But he put personal liberty first. The right solution to which he ultimately turned is just as right for us today. We must find a way to organize the law-abiding, peace-loving, self-governing people so that, joined together, they will have the spiritual, moral, economic, political, and military power which no one of them separately possesses.

The effective organization of these peoples, which is the aim of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, is of such overwhelming urgency that it deserves the hard-working support of every true American 24 hours a day.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
July 11, 1956.

HON. WALTER GEORGE,  
*The United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Enclosed are copies of correspondence I have had with the Foreign Minister of Norway and the Foreign Minister of Italy.

I am sending them for possible inclusion in your record of the hearings on July 10.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

JUNE 21, 1956.

HIS EXCELLENCY HALVARD LANGE,  
*Foreign Minister of Norway,  
NATO Headquarters, Paris, France:*

Permit me to wish every success in reaching agreement with the Foreign Ministers of Canada and Italy on proposals to broaden and strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in economic and political fields. As the author of a bill pending in the United States Congress which is designed to strengthen the role of the United States in developing the economic and political cooperation of the Atlantic Alliance that was foreseen in its charter. I shall be extremely interested in the outcome of your current conversations and will do all I can as an American legislator to support extension of NATO activities in nonmilitary fields. I would recommend for your consideration the method proposed in my bill with which I know you are familiar.

ESTES KEFAUVER,  
*United States Senator.*

Identical cablegram to Gaetano Martino.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Warmly thank you for your kind message and wishes. With my colleagues I will make every effort in bringing our task to the best possible end.

GAETANO MARTINO.

JUNE 25, 1956.

Senator KEFAUVER,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Thank you so much for your encouraging message which reached me during my conversations with my colleagues from Canada and Italy in Paris recently. I know they share with me the earnest wish that the result of our work shall forward our common objectives and command general support from governments and public opinion in all our member countries.

HALVARD LANGE, *Foreign Minister.*

THE UNITED STATES FLAG COMMITTEE,  
*Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y., July 9, 1956.*

HON. WALTER GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: We wish to state our opposition to being limited to 10 minutes at the hearings July 11, re the Atlantic Union Resolution 12. We believe the flag committee should not be allotted any more time than any others, but we do know that 10 minutes is not sufficient time in which to defend the United States against this aggressive resolution, which we believe should never have recognition given it in the first place, by any congressional committee, the

members of which have taken an oath to protect the Constitution against just such dangers.

If so many have requested to be heard at these hearings that a limit of 10 minutes is necessary to hear them all in 1 day, then the time should be extended another day. If that is not possible, then they should not be held at all. At the end of a busy session of Congress is no time to be bringing up such an all-important matter. This should receive unlimited time if at all. It seems fantastic and almost unbelievable that loyal Americans should have to travel to Washington to testify for our constitutional form of government, before a committee, many of whom are sponsors of this resolution, dangerous to the very existence of our Nation, whether they are limited or unlimited. But to allow Americans 10 minutes only, to uphold our country and our Government as against the enemies within with which the very Senators listening to this testimony are in some cases sympathetic, counter to their oath, seems extremely serious and worthy of mention.

As far as we know, this is still a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," meaning all of them, and not a government by the Foreign Relations Committee. The people are the Government although the elected seem to forget that fact. It should be the privilege of all the people, not merely the internationalists, to decide the fate of our Nation in such a matter as changing or overthrowing our form of government. We believe that no Member of Congress who sponsors this or any other plan to destroy our form of government should be reelected at the coming elections.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN P. LASELL.

Please include this letter in the printed hearings of the Atlantic Union Convention Resolution 12.

JULY 12, 1956.

Mrs. HELEN P. LASELL,  
*The United States Flag Committee,  
Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y.*

DEAR MRS. LASELL: Chairman George has asked me to acknowledge your letter of July 9, 1956.

A full opportunity was given to all of the witnesses who testified yesterday at the third public hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. Mrs. Enid Griswold, of Montclair, N. J., appeared on behalf of your organization. The committee was able to hear everyone who was scheduled for yesterday's meeting, and who made an appearance.

Your letter points to a problem which confronts the committees of Congress, not only toward the end of a session, but which prevails at other times during the session. Four important committees had meetings scheduled for yesterday and because Members of the Senate are assigned to various committees it was necessary for Members to divide their morning time as best they could in order to meet these assignments. The same situation would have prevailed had the hearing been extended through today. This will explain the reference to "pressures on committee members' time" which was mentioned in the telegrams that went out requesting witnesses to limit their oral statements. An added burden, so far as committee members are concerned, was the fact that the Senate met at noon and the Senate was scheduled to pass upon some five matters that were the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations in that they had been reported by this committee.

As you will recall, the committee devoted 2 days in the last session of Congress to holding hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. The committee decided at a meeting some weeks ago to hold another day of hearings, at which time the opponents would be given a further opportunity to complete the record of their position on the matter. Notice was given June 8, 1956, to everyone who had contacted the committee that such a hearing would be held early in July.

Sincerely yours,

CARL MARCY.

P. S.—I might add that all witnesses who appeared were given an opportunity to include statements in the record in addition to their oral comments.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
July 10, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: In connection with your committee's further consideration tomorrow of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, I enclose for your information a resolution supporting an Atlantic convention adopted by the National Student Congress which met in June in Muskogee, Okla.

The National Student Congress, which is modeled on the National Congress, is composed of high-school students throughout the United States. It may well be that the youth of this Nation possess a clearer understanding of our international problems than do some of us older folks.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere demands united action by the world's leading democracies; and

"Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has already committed its members to 'contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions' and 'to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them'; and

"Whereas it is essential to determine by what means the democracies can further unify their efforts in the military, political, and economic fields to achieve these objectives; and

"Whereas it is desirable that this problem be considered by delegates who would act in accordance with their individual convictions and make a public report of their joint findings and recommendations: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the National Student Congress, That the President should invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from other such democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS,  
*Washington, D. C., July 10, 1956.*

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,*  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: The Military Order of the World Wars, composed of those who served as officers in World Wars I and II (with chapters in all principal cities throughout the Nation) wishes to register its opposition to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

We have consistently opposed this Atlantic Union proposal since November 1949. The records will show that Rear Adm. William R. Furlong, as a member of national legislature committee, has appeared several times in the year past before the committees of Congress in opposition to world government and Atlantic Union.

Our resolution on the subject matter reads:

"Whereas the present voluntary association of governments in the United Nations offers the most practical means for resolving world problems in a manner to preserve the peace of the world without the attempt to apply military force by a super world government: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Military Order of the World Wars recognizes the United Nations as the international organization under which the nations of the earth should develop their future course through mutual understanding; and be it further

"Resolved, That we oppose world government and Atlantic Union in any form."  
Respectfully submitted.

EDWIN S. BETHLEHEM, Jr.,  
*Colonel, AUS. (Retired), Adjutant General.*

GUARDIANS OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE,  
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1956.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: As president of the Guardians of Our American Heritage, I am enclosing the organization's resolution opposing Atlantic Union, passed by the National Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, comprising some 20 women's patriotic organizations, in January of this year.

Also enclosed is an editorial on Atlantic Union, published in the Guardians of Our American Heritage bulletin of January 1955, which states fully by documentation and photostats our reasons for opposing this organization and our suggesting that "\* \* \* a thorough investigation of Atlantic Union Committee and its fellow travelers is in order."

I respectfully request that the enclosed documentation be made part of the hearing and be printed in the hearing report.

Very truly yours,

NAGENE C. BETHUNE.

ATLANTIC UNION—RESOLUTION PASSED IN JANUARY 1955 AT WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC  
CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

RESOLUTION NO. 31

Whereas under the internal revenue laws contributions to political organizations are not deductible for income-tax purposes; and

Whereas the Atlantic Union, its officers and members are engaged in political activity throughout the United States; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the foregoing, Atlantic Union has been granted tax exemption: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Atlantic Union is not entitled to and should not have been granted tax exemption under the income-tax laws; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to review the decision granting Atlantic Union tax exemption; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this matter be called to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives for such action as might be deemed necessary to prevent any repetition of such abuse of the internal revenue laws; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

(The second item referred to is on file with the committee.)

BROOKLYN, N. Y., July 7, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would appreciate very much your having the attached lead editorial of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet of June 30, 1956, entitled "On Staying Free," incorporated in the record of the hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Sincerely yours,

H. JOSEPH MAHONEY.

[From the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., June 30, 1956]

ON STAYING FREE

This July 4, Independence Day, as we enjoy our country's freedom, the priceless heritage of the Declaration of Independence, we must do more than perfunctorily commemorate the glorious moment of our national history when our brave forefathers, face to face with absolute tyranny, solemnly published and declared "That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states." In today's world, where modern tyranny's tentacles reach out farther and farther to choke the true liberty of more and more independent and sovereign nations, we must put the emphasis on staying free.



Our country, born in the travail of tyranny, must remain, under God's providence, forever free and independent. Otherwise, there will be wanton squandering of the hard-earned inheritance of freedom, left us by the Founding Fathers, who fearlessly stated, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Our freedom is our real national wealth. Unless it is guarded watchfully, it may be stolen from us. Unless we alertly and positively preserve it, we may waste it to the point of bankruptcy, suffering eventually its complete loss.

The present-day danger to our freedom is not direct assault upon it. The deadly danger today lies in the more subtle attack which, persistently gnawing in hidden and unsuspected ways, would whittle away to nothing the freedom which properly is our people's proudest possession.

Is there not cause for alarm, for example, in the fact that during the very month when we celebrate the origin of our independence there are scheduled hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the exploratory resolution of the Atlantic Union Committee? That resolution calls for a meeting of NATO countries "to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

The language of the Atlantic Union resolution certainly contradicts the language of the Declaration of Independence. So, how comes that resolution, somewhat surreptitiously, as far as the honor of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee? This is just another twist of the strategy of the super-staters, who, masquerading in the cloak of freedom, would have our independent country forfeit much or all of her essential sovereignty. They would discard the Declaration of Independence and reduce the United States to the status of a nation dependent upon a federal union. Where our forefathers had the courage to dissolve "all political connection" with a European power, we now find our elected representatives of today entertaining a move once again to allay our country politically with foreign nations.

Loyally following the patriotic example of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, let us stay free. Let us avoid carelessly frittering away our freedom. Let us remember that freedom, once lost, can be regained only at great cost, if at all.

---

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL SECURITY,  
PENNSYLVANIA CHAPTER III,  
Philadelphia, July 10, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: The Pennsylvania chapter of the Society for Constitutional Security desires that this letter and the enclosed resolution be made a part of the record of the hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12.

Whereas Atlantic Union is a form of world government in which the United States could be outvoted on all the issues which would involve our country in political, economic, and military problems on five continents; and

Whereas future civil wars, involving European or native ownership in Europe's farflung colonial possessions may last for centuries; and

Whereas the United States should not commit our sons to fight in an unjust cause promoted by evil men in positions of power in the unknown future anywhere in the world others might order them to fight: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urges the Congress to oppose any encroachment on United States sovereignty as our moral pressure as a sovereign nation may, at some future date, restrain our present lukewarm military allies from acts repugnant to our own ideals and vital interest; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urges the Congress to refuse to take steps to authorize preliminary studies preparatory to converting the military North Atlantic Treaty Organization into a political and economic union.

Adopted Washington, D. C., January 15, 1955.

To quote President Eisenhower, "Happy is the country whose annals are brief."

Sincerely yours,

LEONORA W. KENDALL, *President.*

## STATEMENT OF DORIS B. PARKER, GLEN ROCK, N. J.

I am Mrs. Robert D. Parker, of Glen Rock, N. J. As an individual housewife and mother, with faith in the rights and responsibilities of the individual American citizen, I should like to write into the public hearing record the opinion that the currently obsolete resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) should be discarded as impractical, timewasting, unrealistic, and in danger of permanently damaging the rights of us, the American people.

The very idea (which is contained in S. Con. Res. 12) of allowing the President of the United States, or the Congress, to stipulate to other countries how their delegates should be named for an exploratory convention is not only impractical, but disregards the political privileges of other democracies which sponsor the North Atlantic Treaty.

To plot an imaginary union of the sort is as fantastic as expecting a physician, in the light of present-day, scientific progress, to introduce RH negative blood into the constitution of an individual with RH positive findings. When we know that the principal political party is communism in some of the countries who desire an Atlantic Union, it would seem like preparations for homicide and suicide for Congress to sign an order for Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, beginning with paralysis of our democratic type of government.

Let us not waste time on the unrealistic ideas contained in the 12th Resolution and burden a God-loving President and Congress with new powers that weaken our Bill of Rights.

Let us progress as responsible American citizens and urge the adoption of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1 and H. J. Res. 41) which has already slept too long in committee. This Congress-strengthening amendment seems the best antidote for creeping communistic thinking and a certain fortifier for the continuation and growth of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Let us go forward in setting a better example for other countries and ourselves, with trust in God that Congress will carry out the thinking of the American people and act to strengthen our spiritual unity between peoples and nations.

## STATEMENT OF R. R. PURSELL, PURSELL PUBLISHING CO., PLYMOUTH, MICH.

This month we celebrate the separation of this country from another country which we felt had a very selfish interest in the relationship. Allowing a situation to develop into the loss of this colony was perhaps the greatest mistake England ever made. Now a great many of the 1,200 Rhodes scholars in the United States are urging that we must reunite in one way or another.

Other nations are looking with envy on our wealth and on our gigantic production of wealth and are running out of reasons why we should share it. Giving fifty-five-odd billions of dollars in aid recently has developed their appetites as well as our national debt. So plans for world government spring up from many sources.

If we accept the "bait" of peace they offer, then we must surrender 92 percent of the title to the rights of our properties and incomes to a supergovernment. Having but 8 percent of the world's population, we could expect to have but 8 percent of the voting rights in the legislative body of such supergovernment. While giving aid to a neighbor, either at home or abroad, has always been a generous habit of Americans, there is absolutely no need to give away 92 percent of our ownership in our incomes in order to continue to be a good neighbor.

## BIGGER GOVERNMENTS TRAMPLE ON SMALLER UNITS

Two examples will show how easily we are outvoted by larger units of government:

First, in the United Nations, on the individual's right to own real estate, 14 nations (including Canada) voted against Turkey and ourselves voting for that basic right. The socialistic nations are just too many for us.

Second, in the *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* case, our own Supreme Court voided the sedition laws of 42 States, Alaska, and Hawaii in the very face of the Smith Act declaration that nothing in that act shall take away any State's rights. What Congress intended was one thing; what the States got was something different.

Lofty intentions about peace aren't good enough when we bargain our liberty away for a mess of pottage. Aiding the farmers seemed to be a worthy thing to do by Congress. But our own State prison at Jackson was fined \$499 because it grew too much wheat for its own inmates. Also a county poorhouse had several hundred bushels of wheat locked up because it, too, grew too much wheat; and, at the same time, it had to buy wheat on the open market for its hungry poor old men and women. Of course, Congress had no intentions of causing these hardships. But in any process of trading liberty for a promise of security the people often enjoy neither.

#### WORLD GOVERNMENT ADVOCATES ARE NOW IN TWO CAMPS

The first are the Moscow Communists, who have sworn to never rest until the final triumph of world socialism is achieved. It is the belief of many that the Communists have captured the United Nations and will use it to further their plans. We have contributed about \$650 million to the U. N. in an effort to buy peace. Yet communism is marching forward at 1,000 square miles a day and we of the free world haven't gotten back 1 inch. The U.N. is as powerless to protect us as it has been to protect the 700 million people taken behind the Iron Curtain.

The second group includes those who fear being sucked up by the Red terror and ask for world government for greater protection. While this Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 seems to include only the North Atlantic nations it is headed for world government because the possessions of the NATO countries stretch clear around the world. Inasmuch as delegates from other countries are also to be invited by the convention—it will run into a world government plan. Organized to hold back communism NATO has cost us \$252 billion, has cost other NATO countries \$62 billion—yet the Red terror comes on and on, 1,000 square miles a day.

Neither one of the above-mentioned camps can destroy America if we will protect our Federal Constitution which guarantees all the freedom any man can hope to have.

Mr. Elmo Roper, treasurer of the Atlantic Union Committee, said in his widely circulated speech "The Goal Is Government of All the World":

"These governments would merge into a single Atlantic Federal Union. Such a nation would have the right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between states in the union, and grant union citizenship. The union must have the power to tax and to uphold its own bill of rights."

Folks who are thinking along those lines are not adding to man's freedom but are planning on the Senate of the United States giving away our constitutional rights to self-government just as the Senate gave away the soldiers' constitutional rights when they went abroad. I don't believe that our forefathers ever intended that the treaty powers would be used to destroy constitutional rights of the individual.

With the Red terror coming our way—I shudder when I see so many good folks making so much effort to break down our defenses. How long can our beloved Constitution stand the strain of Communists, Socialists, and one-Worlders hacking away at the safeguard of freedom.

We spend billions abroad on an effort to fight communism. Yet good folks here in America are blind to the certainty that the integrated world for which they agitate could be no other than a Communist world with its destruction of our liberties, the confiscation of all our property, and the enslavement of our people in a godless, irreligious vacuum. God forbid.

---

WE, THE PEOPLE,  
AMERICANS UNITED FOR PATRIOTIC ACTION,  
Chicago 2, Ill., July 6, 1956.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,

*Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: The Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, concerning an Atlantic Union Exploratory Convention, is international dynamite and a great threat to American independence and the sovereignty of every American citizen.

We respectfully request that your committee defeat this resolution, which is designed to pave the way for World Government under which the American

citizen will lose his constitutional safeguards for the defense of his God-given freedom.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY T. EVERINGHAM.

---

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN LAYMEN,  
*Madison, Wis., July 9, 1956.*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: I wish to make a statement to the committee in the matter of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

Being unable to be present at the hearing, I have placed copies of my statement in the hands of Mr. R. Roy Pursell, of Plymouth, Mich., who has kindly agreed to present them when he makes his appearance before your committee.

While the caption over my statement as it is typed makes it clear that I speak as an individual only, it may be of help to the committee in understanding how Fundamentalists Christians feel in these matters if I make the following brief statement:

The statement which Mr. Pursell will present to you is but a slight modification of a statement which I made to the Subcommittee on United Nations Charter of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations at a hearing at Milwaukee, Wis., April 10, 1954. As one of my duties as president of American Council of Christian Laymen, I edit the council's news letter, *Challenge*. Subsequent to the Milwaukee hearing, I published my statement in full, in *Challenge*, which was sent to all members and cooperators of this council. I received not even one adverse comment.

Very sincerely,

VERNE P. KAUB.

---

#### AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MUST OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENT

Statement of Verne P. Kaub, Madison, Wis., retired from active business and serving as president of American Council of Christian Laymen, prepared for presentation to Subcommittee on United Nations Charter of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, at a hearing at Milwaukee, Wis., April 10, 1954

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT

It is my studied opinion, based upon what I know of the words and deeds of others of like mind as well as upon my own thinking, that Bible-believing American Christians must oppose all moves in the direction of world government, these including proposals to limit or abandon the veto power in U. N. and other measures designed to give U. N. authority over the lives and destinies of people of all nations.

The purported objectives of U. N., insofar as they relate to extension of human rights, safe from war or threat of war, are fine and noble, and have the approval of all Christians. But U. N. seeks to bring about this worldwide utopia through enforceable agreements about trade rights, national boundaries, and atom bombs. All this is folly. Agreements mean nothing to dictators and politicians who know no God.

Even more important, freedom is not a material thing, and it cannot be attained by manipulation of material things. Freedom is a spiritual concept, and is attainable here on earth only if and when manmade laws are brought into harmony with God's laws.

I love America not so much because our Nation is the richest and most powerful in the world, but because it is the land of freedom. Our Nation is at once the greatest and freest Nation because it was founded on Christian principles. The American heritage of freedom is the hope of the world only because it is a Christian heritage. This is a modern statement of the greatest of truths: from the beginning of time Christ has been the hope of the world.

When Thomas Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence it was the first time in history that man had written into a political document cardinal principles of the Christian faith, the importance and dignity of the individual, and the equality of men before the law and in the sight of their Creator. Later, the founders wrote the Constitution to be the enabling document and give reality to the Christian concept of human freedom.

The Founders, writing the Constitution, cast aside every shred of the Old World's cringing adherence to statism, accepting without reservation the Christian concept of sovereignty of the individual. Every other nation has had this same opportunity to pave the way to freedom, but not one has cared or dared to take final leave of materialism and risk all to gain freedom by giving free rein to God's laws.

So, America alone holds the Christian heritage of freedom, which will be finally, utterly lost if it is melted down with the dross of Old World statism, materialism, and atheism. Only if America stands firm as one nation unafraid to lift aloft God's banner of truth and justice, inviting reluctant nations to stand with her, can this Christian heritage be saved for future generations.

Collective security never was more than a dream, and an evil one at that, really a nightmare. We cannot forget what happened in Korea, what is happening in Indochina, what happened only a few years ago under the same management which set up U. N., when the pretendedly free nations sold all Central Europe, from Berlin east, into abject slavery.

Representatives of great organizations of Protestant churches will appear—have appeared on similar occasions—to argue for collective security, claiming it can be attained by application of the principles of the universal brotherhood of man. In Christianity there is no universal brotherhood, but only the brotherhood of followers of Christ.

Pretending to speak with the voice of a united Protestantism, the National Council of Churches ceaselessly supports that greatest of fallacies, collective security. The real truth is that the National Council has only a partial right to speak for no more than 36 percent of American Protestants, and not even a shadow of right to speak for 64 percent of the Protestants of our Nation.

Complete documentation of this declaration is contained in the leaflet titled, "The National Council Speaks—For Whom?," which is a publication of American Council of Christian Laymen. A copy of this leaflet is submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate with request that it be made a part of the record of this present hearing.

---

FOR AMERICA LEAGUE.  
Rockford, Mich., July 10, 1956.

C. C. O'DAY,  
*Foreign Relations Committee,*  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed wire went to you today. On account of important local developments, absolutely impossible testify before your committee July 11. Request that my following statement be read and entered on record. It is planned to cover less than 10 minutes reading time.

Statement for For America League of Grand Rapids and of Michigan, covering proposed Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, Atlantic Union, in lieu of personal appearance.

Quoting Elmo Roper, treasurer, Atlantic Union Committee, whose member. Senator Kefauver, introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, under consideration.

"The Goal Is Government of All the World" (title of his speech). "In not too many years from now I hope that we will attain one world in reality." \* \* \* "Merge into a single Atlantic Federal Union. Such a nation would have the right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between states in the union, and grant citizenship. The union must have the power to tax and to uphold its own bill of rights."

In other words America is being sold a bill of goods by which we become in relation to this Atlantic Union the same as one of our States is in reference to United States of America, and considering that our States by means of laws made by United States Supreme Court and exorbitant taxes levied by United States Government are becoming mere administrative divisions helping the United States Government police United States of America; we can assume the United States Government under the Atlantic Union would receive its orders, pay its taxes to a government in which none of the rulers would even be United States of America citizens. The power to tax is the power to destroy. Hence exorbitant taxes levied by this foreign government against the United States of America would funnel our wealth to tear down the United States, build up for-

eign governments. This is peaceful conquest of America—with her consent. The bill of rights governing us would be that of the Atlantic Union—foreign soldiers would be stationed in the United States of America; not subject to our Bill of Rights. Our Armed Forces like those of our States would be under control of foreign Atlantic union bosses.

What has come over America that she can even consider surrender of her sovereignty and freedom and flag and wealth and know-how without a war, without a battle? Are our leaders weakkneed or simpletons? Or have some sold out the United States of America? The fact that such a great country should even consider taking in as equal partners—bankrupt Europe—must make Red infiltrators hold their sides.

American patriots are watching the votes of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Will they be able to comment that \$18,500 yearly has been unable to raise the recent low stature of the United States Senate.

FOR AMERICA LEAGUE,

F. J. TOOHEY,

*Major, United States Army (Retired), Chairman.*

DETROIT, MICH., July 9, 1956.

Mr. C. C. O'DAY,

*Clerk of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,*

*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find a resolution from the Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalists.

We trust that this resolution will be incorporated into the hearings on Senator Kefauver's Atlantic Union Exploratory Convention (S. Con. Res. 12) which is to be held some time in July.

Thanking you for giving this your attention.

Very truly yours,

MARY M. STRETT,

*Chairman, Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalists.*

#### RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN COALITION OF CONSTITUTIONALISTS

Whereas our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, fortunes and sacred honor to preserve this country; and

Whereas Americans have given their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to NATO countries as well as most parts of the world; and

Whereas America finds these same countries unable to agree to any great extent among themselves; and

Whereas with the completion of NATO or Atlantic Union, we shall then proceed with SEATO along with the U. N. and UNESCO to complete a World Government, and

Whereas there was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator Kefauver Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to name delegates to explore to what extent these people might further unite within the frame of the United Nations and agree to form federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union; and

Whereas the proponents of this resolution aim at expanding the present military alliance of NATO into a Federal political union which requires the surrender of basic powers of our own President, the Congress, and the States, to the Atlantic Union and makes drastic changes in our form of government, discarding our Constitution and Bill of Rights; and

Whereas the calling of the delegates by our Government to explore the possibilities of a surrender of powers to form a superpolitical union, places our Government in the position of favoring such a union; and

Whereas a number of resolutions of like import and wording have been introduced into the House of Democrats and Republicans alike: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we call upon Senators and Congressmen demanding that they do their sworn patriotic duty under the Constitution and in obedience to the laws of our land, and for the welfare of the American people—we stand unalterably opposed to world government in any form and under any name.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
*Washington, D. C., July 9, 1956.*

Memorandum for Senator GEORGE:

A joint resolution for a North Atlantic Exploratory Convention is to be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate tomorrow. I think this has sufficient interest to warrant your consideration, and if you were to favor it I believe it would be reported favorably to the Senate, since it already has many sponsors.

In its amended form it would call for an exploratory convention as a means of strengthening the North Atlantic Community without any commitments on any side to accept what may be produced. The calling of such a convention, to my mind, would help to accomplish a number of our objectives.

1. Help to hold NATO together and strengthen our weakening ties in face of the relaxed Soviet policy.

2. Save our bases in Europe now threatened by all of the fall-out publicity.

3. Have the dramatic value of seizing the initiative in the war of ideas by refocusing attention on our unique American contributions to freedom and the democratic processes.

4. Retrieve our mutual military assistance program with a more united approach.

5. Aid in solving our military budgetary problems by a common approach to the weapons program.

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE, *Director.*

×